RB
No. PE1109. F78
vol. 1

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.

April 1832.

THE

TRUE ENGLISH GRAMMAR:

BEING

AN ATTEMPT

TO FORM A GRAMMAR

OF THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE,

NOT MODELLED UPON THOSE

OF THE

LATIN, GREEK,

AND OTHER

FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

BY

WILLIAM B. FOWLE,

Instructer of the Monitorial School, Boston.

"What reason did not dictate, reason can never explain."

Dr. Johnson.

[Vol. 1]

BOSTON:

MUNROE AND FRANCIS,

128 WASHINGTON-STREET.

1827.

PE1109
.F78
Vol. 1

52385

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO WIT:

District Clerk's Office.

Be it remembered, that on the twentieth day of January, A. D. 1827, in the fifty-first year of the Independence of the *United States of America*, William B. Fowle, of the said District, has deposited in this Office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as proprietor, in the words following, *to wit:*

"The True English Grammar: being an attempt to form a Grammar of the English Language, not modelled upon those of the Latin, Greek, and other Foreign Languages. By William B. Fowle, Instructer of the Monitorial School, Boston.

What reason did not dictate, reason can never explain."

Dr. Johnson.

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned:" and also to an act, entitled, "An act supplementary to an act, entitled an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching, historical and other prints."

JOHN W. DAVIS, *Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.*

PREFACE.

THE leading principles of this grammar are those divulged by John Horne Tooke, and corrected and improved by his commentators, particularly by James Gilchrist. All the respectable Grammars were examined, from those of Dr. Crombie and the Encyclopedias, down to those of Lindley Murray and his followers. From the hints discovered in these writers, the author has endeavoured to ascertain the real principles which should form the basis of a proper English Grammar, and his chief merit, if there be any, consists in his attempt to collect these scattered hints, mould them into something like a system, and then, by suitable illustrations and practical exercises, to adapt them to general use.

It was his first intention to publish merely what he considered the essentials of English Grammar, without any illustration or reference to the Grammars now in use; but, considering that what may be clear to him may not be so clear to others, unless they are furnished with a clue to the reasoning which produced his conviction, he has examined the opinions of other grammarians when an opportunity was offered in the course of the work, and has collected in an Appendix such other remarks as were thought necessary. As these remarks can be of no use to those who have never studied any grammar, the author regrets that there is any necessity for increasing the bulk of his book by their insertion.

As to the policy of changing the prevailing system, now that it is so comfortably established in all our schools, it may

be observed, that because an errour is popular and extensively propagated, it is not the less an errour; and he trusts that he is not alone in despising that policy which sacrifices truth and propriety to prescription and expediency. Those who are accustomed to the old system will of course consider this the most difficult for children, but, besides the obligation to go right, whether it be easiest or not, the experience of the author satisfies him that while those who have been instructed on Murray's plan very easily understand this, this presents no peculiar obstacles to those who have never studied grammar.

The author does not pretend to have ascertained exactly what English Grammar should be, but merely to have made some approach to it. Much less does he pretend to be armed at all points, and ready to overthrow all the exceptions and difficulties which may be arrayed against his system; he only hopes that, if his positions are untenable, he shall be furnished with better by those who fairly drive him from them.

The regular and arduous duties of his situation must be his excuse for any carelessness in the execution of the work; as the urgent need of a rational grammar for the use of his pupils must be his apology for attempting what many others could, and long ago should have better executed.

Jan. 18, 1827.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

Q. What is English Grammar?

A. Rules for writing or speaking the English language founded upon the peculiar structure and proper use of it.

Q. Into how many branches is grammar usually divided?

A. Grammar is divided into four branches.

Q. Which is the first branch?

A. Orthography or spelling.

Q. Where do we find particular rules for Orthography or Spelling?

A. In Dictionaries and Spelling Books.

Q. What is the second branch of Grammar?

A. Etymology, or the origin, changes and classification of words when considered separately.

Q. What is the third branch of Grammar?

A. Syntax, or the putting of words together to form sentences.

Q. Where do we find the particular rules for Etymology and Syntax.

A. In what are usually called Grammars.

Q. Which is the fourth branch of Grammar?

A. Prosody, or the rules for pronouncing words, and making verse or poetry.

Q. Where may the particular rules for Prosody be found?

A. In treatises on Rhetorick, which is the art of Reading and Speaking.

ETYMOLOGY.

NOUNS.

Let the teacher or monitor now say to the pupil, the English language contains many thousand words, each of which has a different *meaning*, but not a different *use*. By ascertaining the *use* of words, we are enabled to form them into *Classes* with tolerable precision.

Q. What is the first class of words?

A. Such as are *names* of *things*.

Q. What are *names of things* usually called by grammarians?

A. Nouns.*

Let the Teacher say to his pupils, *Book* is the name of a thing, so is *house*, *sky* and *John*. Then let each Pupil give the name of a thing until perfectly familiar with the exercise.

As children will name only such things as are subject to the senses, the teacher will name one or two, as, *virtue*, *genius*, and *poverty*, which may be said to exist, but are seen only in their effects.

Names of things *which have substance*, or that we can see, feel, hear, taste or smell, are called *physical* nouns; and such as cannot be perceived by the senses are called *metaphysical* nouns.

Q. What *kind* of a noun is head, hope,

* *Noun* is derived from the Latin *nomen*, or the French *nom*, which words mean a *name*.

chair, anger, hat, king, nose, cold, fear, avarice, money, want, memory, shoe, and so on. If the child answers wrong, let the teacher ask, "can you or can you not see, feel, hear, taste or smell it ?"

Q. When is a noun or name said to be *physical ?*

A. When it is the name of something subject to our senses.

Q. When is a noun or name said to be *metaphysical ?*

A. When it is not subject to the senses.

NUMBER.

Let the teacher or monitor say to the pupils, when we speak of things we must speak either of a single thing, or of more than one, and this distinction is called *Number*. When we speak of a *single* thing, we say the noun is in the *singular* number ; and when we speak of more things than one, we say the noun is in the *plural** number. When we speak of one, we say *horse*, and when of more than one, *horses*.

Q. How many numbers have nouns ?

A. Two, Singular and Plural.

Q. How many does the *singular* number express ?

A. One.

Q. How many does the *plural* number express ?

A. More than one.

Q. Of what number is book, books, name, names ?

---

* Plural is derived from the Latin word *pluris*, which means *more*.

Q. What is the plural of boy, girl, hat, slate, bell, gown, door, church, wish, kiss, fox, cent, cup, hope, fear, hand, eye, hero, echo? and as many more as the teacher pleases to ask the pupil.

Q. What is the singular of windows, steps, nails, desks, pens, pencils, horses, dogs, dollars, letters, ideas, proofs, points, nouns, kings, arches, keys, laws, ways? and so on.

Q. What is the plural of hoof, roof, grief, relief, mischief, handkerchief, dwarf, muff, ruff, cuff, snuff, stuff, puff, cliff, skiff?

Q. What letter or letters do you add to the singular of these words and of most others in our language, to make them plural?

A. S or ES.

Q. Some do not follow this rule. How do you spell the singular, and then the plural, of fly, cry, glory, cherry, duty, folly, lily, deputy, ally?

Q. How is the plural of these nouns ending in Y, preceded by a consonant, formed?

A. By changing the Y into IES.

Q. How do you spell the singular and plural of loaf, sheaf, self, shelf, wolf, half, calf, wharf?

Q. How is the plural of these nouns ending in F formed?

A. By changing the F into VES.

Q. Some nouns are still more irregular.

What is the plural of man,* woman, child, brother,† ox, foot, tooth, goose, louse, mouse, sow, die, penny?‡

Q. What is the plural of wife, life, knife?

Q. What nouns are the same in both numbers?

A. Deer, sheep, fish, pair, hose, youth.§

Q. What nouns appear to have no singular?

A. Riches, alms, scissors, goods, bowels, bellows.

Q. What nouns appear to have no plural?

A. Names of metals; some *metaphysical* nouns, and, in general, such things as may be weighed or measured, as gold, pride, wool, oil, &c.‖

---

* *En* is the regular plural termination in the Saxon language from which the English is partly derived.

† *Brothers* is now generally used instead of the old plural *brethren.*

‡ *Pence* is *pennys* pronounced hastily.

§ We say *pairs* and couples, when speaking of persons; and although *fish* is both singular and plural, we have the regular plural *fishes.* So *youth* and *folk* are used plurally, although we have *youths* and *folks.*

‖ We can, however, use these words in the plural without doing violence to the language; as, *golds* vary in fineness. There are more *prides* than one. The coarser *wools.* The vegetable *oils.*

Metaphysicks, politicks, ethicks, pneumaticks, gymnasticks, and mathematicks are generally considered plural.

Means is of both numbers, but the singular, *mean,* is sometimes used.

News is now used as a singular noun.

Pains is singular or plural.

Drawers, trowsers, pantaloons, &c. are plural. Although but one thing may be meant, yet it consists of two parts, so with *bellows, scissors,* &c.

The English grammarians call *ashes* plural, but in New-England it is oftener used as singular.

Q. What is meant by a *Collective* noun?

A. A *Collective* noun includes many similar things under a general name. *Army* is the *collective* name for many soldiers, *school* is the *collective* name for many scholars.

Q. Of what number is a *collective* noun?

A. It may be used either as singular or plural.

The following are collective nouns. Nation, tribe, flock, drove, fleet, swarm, assembly, grove, jury, corporation, band. Ask the pupil what a *nation* is a collection of? then ask the same question of *tribe*, &c.

GENDER.

Q. Why are nouns divided into genders?*

A. To distinguish their sexes.

Q. Into how many genders are English nouns divided?

A. Three; masculine, feminine, and neuter.

Q. What nouns are *masculine*?

A. Names of males.

Q. What nouns are *feminine*?

A. Names of females.

Q. What names are *neuter*?†

A. Such as are neither male nor female.

Q. Of what gender is boy, girl; brother, sister; husband, wife; king, queen; lad,

---

* The word *gender* means a *kind*.

† *Neuter* is a Latin word which means *neither*.

lass; lord, lady; man, woman; father, mother; master, mistress; uncle, aunt; nephew, niece; son, daughter; friar, nun; ram, ewe? &c.

Q. What is the gender of actor, actress; count, countess; host, hostess; heir, heiress; tailor, tailoress; lion, lioness; tiger, tigress; prince, princess; priest, priestess; shepherd, shepherdess; hero, heroine; widow, widower?

Q. What is the gender of officer, book, chair, slut, sloven, bachelor, maid, pen, heart, hope, captain, monitress, patroness, boot, virtue, seamstress, grandfather, bride, bridegroom, minister, parson, nurse, doctor, mayor, energy, envy, ingratitude, support?

Q. What nouns are said to be of the common gender?

A. Such as may be applied either to males or females.

Q. Of what gender is *parent* when it means a mother?

Q. Of what gender is parent when it means a father?

Q. Of what gender is *child* when it means a son?

Q. Of what gender is child when it means a daughter?

Q. Ask the same questions in regard to cousin, friend, enemy, neighbour, teacher,

monitor, instructer, guide, writer, speaker, leader, rival, &c.

Now let the teacher require the pupils to name a masculine, feminine, or neuter noun. After this exercise has become easy to them, let each take a book, and pick out nouns, and then tell their gender, number, and *kind*. If the noun be singular, let the child tell what its plural is, and if plural, let him tell the singular.

AGENT AND OBJECT.

Let the teacher say, nouns sometimes *act* and sometimes are the *object of action*. (When a noun does any thing it is called an *agent*, and when something is done to it, it is called an *object*.)

Let the pupil point out both the *agent* and *object* in the following sentences.

Men strike boys.
Boys strike dogs.
Dogs kill cats.
Cats kill rats.
Rats gnaw cheese.
Cheese breeds worms.
Worms eat animals.
Animals drink water.
Water wets land.
Land bears flowers.
Flowers perfume air.
Air gives life.

The monitor will show the pupil, that the distinction of *agent* and *object* does not affect the *termination* or *ending* of nouns. Then take a book and reading a sentence, ask *"who or what does this or that?"* "men strike boys;" *who strike boys?* After the *agent* is pointed out, vary the question and ask *"what do men strike?"* an ingenious monitor will easily adapt the question, and no exercise can be more useful to both monitor and pupil.

ADJECTIVES.

Q. What is the *second class* of words called?

A. Adjectives.

Q. What is the *use* of adjectives?

A. Adjectives qualify or distinguish one noun from another.*

Let the teacher say, you are all *boys*, (or girls,) and it would be impossible for me to distinguish one boy from another without using some other word than *boy*. Therefore I must say the *first* boy, the *second* boy, the *third* boy, and so on. Or I may say *this* boy, *that* boy, the *next* boy, the *farthest* boy, &c. or I may say the *tall* boy, the *short* boy, the *little* boy, the *large* boy, and so on. Now, all the words used to distinguish one boy from another are *adjectives*.

House is a noun or name. There may be a *new* house, a *high* house, a *brick* house, and what other kind of house? Each child is required to put some adjective with the word *house*. The teacher will then give other nouns, to each of which every child must join an adjective.

Place an adjective before *boy*, tree, coat, hat, water, weather, dog, apple, book, pen, window, disposition, lesson, picture, room, knife, street, scholar, fire, cloth, meat, bread, shoe, paper, colour, punishment, flower, conduct, wood, eye, contrivance, horse, hand, teeth, and so on, until the pupil is familiar with the use of adjectives.

Then take a book, and reading a sentence where there is an adjective, ask such a question as will lead the child to select the adjective. Thus, in the sentences "He saw a high house," ask "What sort of a house did he see?" "Poor men suffer," "What men suffer?" &c.

DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

Let the teacher separate the three highest scholars from the rest of the class, and say, you three are high, and the adjective *high* distinguishes you from those lower in the class, but I wish to distinguish the three high ones from each other also, how can I do that? Let them first try to do it, and then say, I shall call this one *high*, the next, *higher*, and the head boy, *highest*. Then separate the three *lowest* boys and call the third from the bottom *low*, the next *lower*, and the bottom boy *lowest*.

---

* We love concise definitions, but lest this should seem not to apply to all the words we intend to bring into this class, we remark, that we consider all numerals which *limit*, and all words which *demonstrate* nouns, as in some sense qualifying or distinguishing them from each other.

This is what is called the *Comparison of Adjectives.* There are three degrees of comparison, and to render this plain to the child, let him be required to compare several adjectives, Say, one man is *rich*, another *richer*, and a third *richest.* One man is *poor*, another, how ? and the third, how ? So go on with hard, soft, mild, safe, cheap, loud, sharp, dull, full, kind, wild, green, &c. The child will then be prepared to answer the following questions.

Q. How many degrees of comparison have adjectives ?

A. Three, called first, second and third degrees.

1st degree.	*2d degree.*	*3d degree.*
great	great-er	great-est
wise	wise-r	wise-st

Q. How is the first degree made second ?

A. By adding an *r* when the first degree ends in *e*, and *er* when it ends in any other letter.

Q. How is the first degree made third ?

A. By adding *st* when the first degree ends in *e*, and *est* when it ends in any other letter.

The teacher must now say, there are some adjectives which cannot be compared by adding *r* or *er*, *st* or *est.* We do not say moral, moral*er*, moral*est*, nor generous, generous*er*, generous*est ;* but if three moral persons are compared, we say one is *moral*, the second *more moral*, and the third *most moral ;* or else, one is *moral*, the second *less moral*, and the third, *least moral.*

Let the children compare, in this way, sociable, amiable, pitiful, miserable, interesting, distant, disconsolate, fearful, sorry, peevish, destitute, beloved, approved, dejected, &c. After sufficient practice, ask them,

Q. When *r* or *er*, *st* or *est*, cannot be joined to an adjective how is it compared ?

A. By adding the words *more* or *less* for the *second* degree, and *most* or *least* for the *third* degree.

The teacher will now require the pupil to point out the nouns and adjectives in the following examples, and to tell the *gender* and *number* of the nouns, and the *degree of comparison* of the adjectives.

wise man	higher mountains
wiser opinion	longer stick
wisest actions	dry weather
high tree	older hat
longest lines	highest hills
drier paper	long lesson
old men	most oppressive kings
girls studious	driest fish
generous men	boys least attentive
men more generous	fears less terrible
most pious youth	moderate wish
cold feet	chaste conduct
less frequent visits	more delicate hands
happier times	warmest wishes.

Q. In what degree of comparison is *fairest?* what is its first degree ? what its second ?

Q. In what degree of comparison is *meaner?* what is its first degree ? what its third ?

Ask the same questions respecting thinner, leanest, clean, dirtier, distant, coldest, finer, crooked, blackest, fuller, most favourable, weaker, more ancient, less kind, cheaper, least agreeable, proudest, most foolish, less charitable, dreadful, doubtful, alarming, delightful.

Of adjectives which admit of comparison, there are but four or five which may not be compared by one or both of the preceding methods. These *irregulars* are

1st degree.	*2d degree.*	*3d degree.*
good	better	best
bad	worse	worst
little	less	least
many } much }	more	most

Let the pupil tell the degree of the adjectives, and the gender and number of the nouns in the following sentences.

good temper	better world
worse people	worst men
least chance	less truth
more money	much pains
little children	best knives
bad allies	most folks.

Here let the teacher repeat to the pupil that the *use* of adjectives is to qualify or distinguish nouns; but that there are many adjectives which cannot be compared. Such are those which express number,* for we can neither say one, oner, onest; nor one, more one, most one; and such as express *order*, for we cannot say first, firster, firstest; nor first, more first, most first.

---

* We are aware that words expressing *number* are by some called nouns, and not without reason. That they are nouns *sometimes* is certain, that they are *always* so is very probable. Nay, there are some who assert that numerals are never *plural* unless the *s* is joined to them, as is the case with ordinals. Thus they say *ten* means *a ten*, *thirteen* means *a thirteen*; *ten men* means *a* or *one* ten of men. The regular plural being *tens*, *thirteens*, &c. *Thirteen* and *ten* in such cases would be what are usually called *nouns of multitude*.

Words expressing number and order include all from one, two, three, ten, hundred, to millions, &c. and from first, second, third, hundredth, to the highest number we can express.

Q. What are adjectives that express number called ?

A. *Numeral* adjectives.

Q. What are adjectives that express order called ?

A. *Ordinal* adjectives.

In the following Exercises let the monitor ask the pupil whether the adjective is *numeral* or *ordinal.* Let him also tell all about the *nouns.*

first man	twenty two scholars
one dollar	second class
ten pence	three bottles
tenth house	third ship
thousandth time	365 days
million cents	12 months
two hundred miles	8th year
fortieth tree	lesson IX
ninety ninth story	chapter XXX
ninety five books	verse 28th

Besides the words which all grammarians allow to be adjectives, there are several classes of them to which they have given other names but which are as good adjectives as those they retain. We have arranged them under six heads that they may have appropriate exercises.

1. All words formed from the adjective *one*, as a, an, any, many, only, alone, none, (that is *no one*,) with the following,

both	which	each	the
several	what	every	this
some	who	either	these
all	whose	neither	it
	whom	other	its
		another	that
		another's	that's
			those

Let the pupil point out the adjectives and nouns in the following sentences, telling the *gender* and *number* of the noun. After doing it with the book open, let the book be shut and the monitor read the sentences to the class.

a poor child	*some* times
an easy chair	*all* ways
any body	*which* girl†
an only child	*what* horse
many things	*who* (man)‡
one boy *alone*	*whose* hat
none (no-one) thing*	*whom* (man)
both hands	*each* lady
several ways	*every* fire

---

* The noun which *none* qualifies is seldom expressed, but when not expressed it is understood. *I have none*, would be an imperfect expression unless we understand *thing*, or some other word. This word is always previously expressed. 'Give me a book?' 'I have *none*.' 'None what?' 'No-one book.'

† The nonsense about *which's* relating to *things* only, and having no declension, needs no refutation.

‡ *Who* and *which* mean the same thing, but we are accustomed often to omit the noun after them; indeed, we seldom or never express it after *who*, but *who* does not change its character on that account. *Who did it?* who *what* did it? who *person* is the answer.. It is remarkable that *whose*, the *possessive case* of *who* generally has the nouns expressed. Per-

either king	*these* folks
neither queen	*it* (thing)§
other goods	*its* thing
another point	*that* gold
another's rights	*that's* thing‖
the worlds	*those* lads
this world	

2. Adjectives indicating or pointing out the *person* who is the agent or object of what is done. They are for

Agents,	*Objects*,
I	me
we	us
thou	thee
ye, you	you
he	him
she	her
they	them

haps *who* may claim a place in the next class of Adjectives. *I gave it to whom?* whom what? *whom person*, the object.

We say indifferently. "Our Father, *which* or *who* art in heaven." *Which* is allowed by some grammarians to admit after it the repetition of what they call its *antecedent*. "Our Father, which (Father) art, &c. It would be very singular if *who*. which is used for the same purpose, and has the same meaning as *which*, could not also admit the noun after it. We differ from these grammarians in that we believe *who* and *which* refer to the noun *already expressed* and do not require its repetition.

§ *It* always means *this*, *the*, or *that*, as does its Latin original *id*, but its noun is seldom expressed.

‖ "This handle is this's, but that is that's," is an expression not uncommon.

I and *me* always point out the person *speaking*.

We and *us* always point out the person speaking in company with others.

I, *me*, *we*, *us*, are said to indicate the *first* person.

Thou and *thee* always point out the person *spoken to*.

Ye and *you* always point out the person spoken to in company with others.

Thou, *thee*, *ye*, *you*, are said to indicate the *second* person.

He and *him*, *she* and *her*, always point out the person spoken of or about.

They and *them* always point out the persons or things spoken of or about.

He, *him*, *she*, *her*, *they*, *them*, are said to indicate the *third* person.

EXERCISES.

In the following exercises the teacher or monitor should ask of what person the adjective is, whether first, second or third? and then why is it said to be of the first, second or third person. He should ask such a question as will lead the pupil to say who is pointed out by the adjective, as in the sentences

"*I the speaker*," ask "I who or what?"
"*I John*," I who? what John?
"*We subscribers*,"* we what? what subscribers?

* It may seem odd to talk of *we subscribers*, but we (the present author) are satisfied that particular subscribers are as much indicated by the word *we* as they would be by the word *good*. Nor does *we* subserve any other purpose than to distinguish persons present from persons absent.

I Paul, this Paul, (and no other Paul.)

Thou Lord, (and not a Lord of the heathen.)

We, the author of this grammar, (and not those authors who differ from us.)

Ye guides, these guides, (and not the blind guides.)

He Murray, that Murray, (who perplexes.)

She Barbauld, that Barbauld (who delights us.)

They grammarians,* those grammarians (who follow Lowth.)

I George, order *you* (persons) to meet *me* (George.)

We kings require *them* (subjects) to obey *us* (kings)

Thou Lord didst form *her* (woman) and give *her* (woman) to *him* (man.)

Ye hypocrites who deceive *us* (men) but cannot deceive *Him* (God.)†

---

* *They* is another spelling of *the*, and of course means this, that, these, those, as the case may be.

† From these examples it appears that it is improper for grammarians to separate the noun from the pronoun by a comma, and then call it a nominative in apposition, meaning the same thing as the pronoun! no word that points out another can belong to the same class, or have the same meaning as the word pointed out. Different names or epithets may be applied to the same person or thing, but we believe nobody pretends that the words called pronouns are *names* of persons or things.

3. Adjectives which point out the object belonging or relating to the person or persons speaking, spoken to, of, or about.

To the 1st person, or person speaking, belong *my*, *mine*, *our*, *ours*.

To the 2d person, or person spoken to, *thy*, *thine*, *your*, *yours*.

To the 3d person, or person spoken of, *his*, *her*, *hers*, *their*, *theirs*.

In the following exercises let the pupil be asked of what person the adjective is, and why it is so. Continue to ask what noun is designated, its number, gender and kind.

my hat
mine eyes
your daughters
our sons
his cattle
her hopes
my hat is not *yours*
thy father is *mine*
her sister is *your* wife
their ruin is *ours*
his money is *theirs*
thine is the glory
thine enemies
thy pride
their fathers
this book is *yours**
this grammar is *ours*
theirs is *the best* house

* It may seem awkward to say yours book, ours grammar, and theirs house, but awkwardness is not incorectness, and because an adjective has been used without its noun until its noun appears a stranger, it does not follow that the adjective is any more a noun than at first. These three adjectives should be written our's, your's, their's, and then as the apostrophe and *s*, mean *add* or *join*, the awkwardness is explained if not removed. See the 4th class of adjectives, or the old possessive case.

4. Adjectives formed from nouns, without altering the noun, as *glass* house, *May* day, *calf* skin, &c.

Adjectives formed from nouns by adding an apostrophe and *s*, or the apostrophe without an *s*, as *man's* pride, *John's* hat, *goodness'* sake, &c.

Exercises on adjectives formed from nouns, unchanged in their termination.

head dress	*house* dog	*Miss* Brown
foot step	*city* hall	Misses *Brown*
ear rings	*state* house	*Miss* Browns
eye sight	*Mister* Ford	*John* Fish
tin pan	*Doctor* Cureall	*Mary* Gould
silver spoons	*Deacon* Short	*Prince* Eugene
pepper box	*Madame* Bard	*King* George
prize poem	*wedding* cake	*President* Adams

We have already remarked that there is hardly a noun in our language which may not be used as an adjective and a verb.

Exercises on adjectives formed from nouns by adding an apostrophe and *s*, or an apostrophe alone.

Every noun in the language has such an adjective formed from it, the monitor therefore can supply as many examples as he pleases in addition to the following. Other adjectives are used, and the monitor must question the child in regard to every thing which he has previously been taught.

my *father's* house	*time's* last day
our *father's* God	*boys'* rude plays
God's perfect law	a true *king's* man
time's loudest trumpet	a fine *book's* cover

my parents' hopes
his wish is England's
their loss is the publick's
goodness' large bounty
Mister Smith's son
Uncle *Toby's* fly
Moses's or Moses' death

Besides supplying other examples the monitor must ask what noun the adjectives of this class are formed from; and then to vary the exercise, let him give the pupils a noun, and require them to form the adjective and *write it* on a slate. A smart child will even supply a noun which is to be qualified especially if the monitor asks "Peter's what?" "boy's what?" and similar questions.

5. Adjectives formed from nouns or adjectives by adding the termination *ly* to them, as friend, friend-ly; time, time-ly; king, king-ly, &c. brave, brave-ly; fine, fine-ly; poor, poor-ly, &c.

The monitor must inform the pupil that the termination *ly* is a contraction of the adjective *like*, and may always be changed into *like*. Thus, a *friend-ly* man is a *friend-like* man; he acted *brave-ly*, means he acted *brave-like*.

Adjectives of this class are compared by adding *more* and *most* or *less* and *least*, as bravely, more bravely, most bravely; bravely, less bravely, least bravely.

In the following exercises the monitor will assist the pupil in finding the noun qualified by asking what is godlike? princelike? &c.

godly man
princely estate
friendly advice
manly conduct
beastly actions
fleshly lusts
priestly dress
neighbourly kindness
a *sightly* mansion
a *nightly* guard
hourly coaches
timely assistance
yearly meetings

Previously to attempting the following exercises, read the note at the bottom of the page,* and then ask the question somewhat in this manner.

Who act *like brave?* answer, *heroes.*

Heroes act *like brave* what? answer, *men or actors.*

Who live *like poor?*

Misers live *like poor* what?

Who die *like humble?*

Kings die *like humble* what?

heroes act *bravely*	wealth comes *slowly*
misers live *poorly*	torrents rush *rapidly*
kings die *humbly*	people walk *badly*
virtue lives *eternally*	fire burns *brightly*
hope cheers *constantly*	smoke rises *gracefully*

---

* If it be urged by grammarians of the old school that these words qualify the *verb* and express the *manner of action*, we think it a sufficient reply to say that when *like* is separated from the adjective, the adverb disappears. They will not pretend that *brave* or *like* separately are adverbs. We are satisfied of the impropriety of calling the *compound* an adverb, or asserting that it qualifies the verb, but what it *does* qualify is not so apparent. We, however, are inclined to think that *like* qualifies the verbs agent or nominative, and the other adjective qualifies some noun understood, which is *often*, we are not prepared to say *always*, the noun derived from the verb. Thus, in resolving the above sentences which are by no means the best suited to our purpose, we should say;

heroes act *like* brave actors or men
misers live *like* poor livers or men
kings die *like* humble diers or men
virtue lives *like* eternal livers or men
hope cheers *like* constant cheerers
wealth comes *like* slow comers
torrents rush *like* rapid rushers
people walk *like* bad walkers, &c.

weather changes *suddenly*	blows fall *heavily*
colds come *easily*	children submit *cheerfully*
winter looks *dismally*	stars shine *faintly*
paper folds *smoothly*	boys study *diligently*
weeds grow *quickly*	girls behave *properly*
wounds bleed *freely*	horses tread *noisily*
girls dance *merrily*	truth developes *gradally*
bears walk *awkwardly*	errour retires *sulkily*
hounds run *swiftly*	

6. Adjectives formed from verbs without altering the verb, as *tell*-tale, *keep*-sake, *go*-cart, &c.

Exercises on adjectives formed from *verbs* (or words expressing *action**) the verb being unchanged in its termination.

a *tell* tale	a *grind* stone	a *hit* mark
my *keep* sake	a *hang* man	a *hurt* finger
his *go* cart	a *pay* roll	a *knit* stocking
the *cling* stones	a *spend* thrift	a *let* horse
a *creep* mouse	a *burst* boiler	a *quit* rent
a *draw* bridge	a *cast* image	a man *rid* of pain
a *set* manner	a *cut* purse	a *run* race

* We are aware that the child has not yet been taught what a *verb* is, but we thought it better to put all the kinds of adjectives together, and besides, the child may now begin to distinguish verbs from other classes of words.

blood *shed* in torrents
a *traveller* come
a *shut* door
a *slit* tongue
a *split* log
a *spread* table
an intruder *thrust* out

The monitor must remark to the pupil that the cases are not numerous where the verb is used as an adjective *without any alteration*, and sometimes the adjective and noun are joined by a hyphen, thus, *tell-tale*, or printed as one word, thus, *telltale*. It is no more necessary, however, to join them in this way, than it is to join any other adjective, as highlife, goodbook, happy-child, or Captain-John-Smith's-long-silly-stories.

Words formed of two or more *single* or *simple* words, in this manner are called *compound* words.

Adjectives formed from verbs by adding *d* or *ed* to them as *admire-d* poem, *neglect-ed* poem, *confus-ed* ideas, &c.

In the following exercises the monitor should require the *verbal* adjective to be pointed out, and the *d* or *ed* to be taken away to find the verb from which it is derived. Sometimes *verbal* adjectives may be compared by *more* and *most*, *less* and *least*.

killed deer
disgusted men
concealed truths
related stories
prescribed rules
collected money
matured judgement
supposed insult
worried dogs
compiled books
respected friends
expected rewards
obscured sky
improved grammar
enlarged minds
rejected absurdities
unshackled thoughts

Every verb in our language (and there are said to be four thousand) has an adjective formed in this manner, if we except about one hundred, which have adjectives, though not formed by adding precisely the same letters as in the above examples. The monitor may give more examples if necessary.

5. Adjectives formed from verbs by adding *ing* to the verb, as chill*ing* cold, neglect*ing* servants, confound*ing* noise, &c.

Every verb in our language (excepting may, can, shall, ought, must, and two or three which are now seldom used,) has an adjective formed in this manner.

The monitor should remark that if the verb ends in *e* the *e* is left out when *ing* is added.

willing minds	*declining* age
hoping hearts	*setting* sun
despairing fears	*sitting* posture
cheering views	*loving* couple
biting dogs	*fighting* cats
bending bows	*writing* books
bleeding wounds	*drawing* paper
feeling men	*whistling* wind
charming sights	*croaking* frogs
alarming news	*singing* birds

The monitor may add other examples, and give out verbs for the child to *spell*, and then to spell the adjective, for children often mistake in these adjectives, which are seldom found in dictionaries and spelling books.

6. Adjectives formed from verbs more irregularly, all of which may be found in the table of irregular verbs.

Only a few exercises are given, but the monitor will find all the *verbal* adjectives which do not end in *ed* or *ing* in the list of irregular verbs on a subsequent page.

a *won* game	a *slain* enemy
a *sold* article	a *lost* sheep
a *worn* garment	a *broken* heart

a new *laid* egg	a *spent* horse
a *fallen* tree	a *bent* stick
a *hidden* treasure	a *cleft* rock
a *known* fact	a *bound* book
wrought iron	a *gilt* ball
a *drunken* man	a *caught* rogue
a *struck* flag	a *gone* case

VERBS.

Q. What are verbs ?

A. Those words which express what the nouns do.

Let the pupil point out the verbs, nouns and adjectives in the following sentences, telling whether the noun be an agent or obj ct, with the number and gender, and pointing out the noun which the adjective qualifies, comparing the adjective, &c. &c.

bad boys do mischief
idle children waste time
pious youth fear God
death spares no age
vice brings sure disgrace
disease shortens life
kings fight other kings
peace promotes happiness
war causes great misery
man is active
morals make the man
friends love their friends
foes injure their foes

Now take a book and require the pupils to pick out verbs. If they mistake, lead them right by asking "does this word mean doing any thing, does it express action," &c.

Q. What is meant by the *tense* of verbs?

A. The time of the action expressed by the verb.

Q. How many times or tenses have verbs?

A. Two, present and past.*

The monitor must ask whether the following verbs are in the present or past form. If the child is unable to answer, let

---

* We do not believe in a *past* any more than a future tense of verbs, and a sufficient reason could be found in the fact that, originally, English verbs had but one termination, and of course no distinction of time. The termination *ed* which is added to verbs and said to make them past, has no reference to time, but like the apostrophe and *s* of nouns, means *add* or *join*. The truth is, if any notion as to time ever exists in connection with any verb, it is wholly accessory or associated, and not signified by the verb itself. In general, what is called the *present* tense simply indicates action; what are called *past* tenses generally indicate action as terminated, which, of course, is closely associated in the mind with the notion of the past. The termination *ed* must contain what there is of past time in the past tense, for take it away and the present tense only remains. If *ed* then expresses past time, all the *participles* in *ed*, (or, as *we* call them, *adjectives*,) express past time, and so do all other words having this termination. A crooked back, must necessarily be one that was crooked some time ago, and not now. "I am delighted" cannot be good English, for *am* is present, and delight*ed* past, and we must not say "I *am now* what is *past*.

Why then, it will be asked, do you retain the past tense? we answer, because that form of the verb must be kept by itself under some name or other, and, with the understanding that although it is generally used with such words as express *past* time, it has primarily no such meaning itself, we may as well retain the old term as make a new one.

For the *Future* tense of Grammarians, see the remarks under the verbs *shall* and *will*.

her put *I* before, and *now* or *yesterday*, after the verb, and she will soon determine the tense.

do	saw	made	hoped
did	took	worked	fall
feel	looked	find	fell
mount	hid	hide	flew
see	held	lost	had
felt	feared	lose	was
mounted	showed	keep	is

Tell the *past* form of the following verbs. Let the monitor at first say, *I go now* and *I go yesterday*, &c. the child will correct the errour.

go	mistake	convert	sing
say	mention	compare	sell
start	oppose	aid	slide
meet	expect	sell	slip
hold	inquire	see	paint
favour	allow	fall	pull
forget	permit	die	put

Tell the *present* form of the following verbs. Let the monitor say "I *taught* you *yesterday*, and I *taught* you now, do I ?" &c.

caught	found	struck	broke
derived	bound	formed	protected
attracted	supported	forced	seated
filled	swelled	served	marked
killed	threw	gave	punished

It has already been said that the adjectives *I* and *we* point out the *first* person, or person speaking ;

Thou, *ye*, and *you*, the *second* person, or person spoken to ;

He, *she*, *it* or *they*, the *third* person, or person spoken of or about.

Had not grammarians *fixed* absurdity, verbs would have nad no variation, but the same word would have been used in *both* tenses, and *all* the persons. What irregularities they have authorized, and perpetuated, may be seen in the following example of a verb with all its changes.*

Name of the verb, to Fear.

Present Tense.

Singular.

1*st pers.*	I (*speaker*)	fear
2*d pers.*	thou (*hearer*)	fear or fear-*est*
3*d pers.*	he, she, it, (*person or thing spoken of*)	fear or fear-*eth* or fear*s*

* The monitor will direct the pupil to notice that in the first person singular, and the three persons plural of the present tense there is no change of termination, and that, even in the two other persons, the simple verb is sometimes used.

In the past tense the verb does not vary, except in the second person singular, and even there has the regular form also.

The terminations *est*, *eth*, *s*, *ed* and *edst*, mean the same thing that is *add* or *join*, and hence there is no more propriety in placing them where they are, than any where else. The fact is, the grammarians found these terminations, and instead of rejecting them altogether or making them uniform, placed them immoveably, we fear, where they now stand.

Plural.

1*st pers.*	we (*speakers*)	fear
2*d pers.*	ye or you (*hearers*)	
3*d pers.*	they (*things spoken of*)	

Past Tense.

Singular.

1*st P.*	I (*speaker*)	fear-*ed*
2*d P.*	thou (*hearer*)	fear-*ed* or fear-*edst*
3*d P.*	he, she, it (*thing spoken of*)	fear-*ed*

Plural.

1*st P.*	we (*speakers*)	fear-ed
2*d P.*	ye or you (*hearers*)	
3*d P.*	they (*things spoken of*)	

As the adjectives usually accompany the noun which is the agent, or are used without the noun's being expressed, the following arrangement may assist the eye and memory of the pupil.

Pres. I, we, ye, you, they, fear.
Thou fear or fearest.
He, she, it, fear, fears or feareth.

Past. I, he, she, it, we, ye, you, they feared.
Thou feared or fearedst.

All the verbs in our language with the few exceptions hereafter mentioned are varied like the verb *fear*.

Were it not for the terminations est and edst, which sometimes accompany the adjective *thou*, and *s*, and *eth*, which sometimes accompany *he*, *she*, *it*, and nouns singular, when spoken of or about, the pupil would have no variations to learn, and there would be no excuse for what are called the persons of verbs and nouns. But until all writers of influence agree to discard these useless terminations, children must be taught the prevailing use of them. This may be done in several ways.

First. Let the monitor require the pupil to take the following verbs, and put them in the place of the verb *fear* ; thus,

Pr. tense, 1st p. sing. I (*speaker*) part
2d p. „ Thou (*hearer*) part or partest, &c.

Let the pupil continue this exercise until he can substitute another verb from memory, or at least succeed by covering the verbs *fear* with his hand or a strip of paper.

part	appear	adopt	paint
treat	disturb	abound	spoil
mind	confound	discard	count
tend	oblige	expect	bless
pound	utter	remark	call
fit	adorn	dismiss	mix
kill	insist	punish	box
pull	admit	check	shower

In all the following exercises the pupil must be told to notice the circumstance that when he adds est, eth, ed or edst to the verb which already ends in e, the e is omitted to prevent two es coming together. Substitute for *fear*.

love	insure	compare	confine
lace	move	inflame	revere
wade	believe	expose	deplore

rage	contrive	advise	atone
came	grieve	desire	hate

Q. When is a verb said to be *regular* ?
A. When its *past* tense ends in *ed.*
Q. When is a verb said to be *irregular* ?
A. When its *past* tense does *not* end in *ed.*

Exercises on the *name of the verb.* The name of every verb must be a verbal noun, sometimes the *agent* but oftener the *object* of other verbs.*

Let the monitor ask the pupil what is the agent and what the object in the following sentences.

To hate means *to dislike.*
To talk tires the lungs.
To be implies vital action.
To run makes us tired.
To deny avails nothing.
To contradict shows ill manners.
To punish prevents crime.
To advise does good.
To be means existence.

---

* We are aware that we tread on dangerous ground, and we frankly confess that what is usually called the *Infinitive mood,* has perplexed us more than any other absurdity of English grammarians. A long and careful examination has led us to the conclusion here avowed, viz. that the Infinitive, in English, is a mere verbal noun.

The monitor will teach the pupil to consider the verbal noun as the *object* of the preceding verb. The word or phrase in the parenthesis is put there to show that another word, meaning the same thing, may be put instead of the verbal noun, and would be called a noun without hesitation. If the *meaning* and *use* are the same, must not both words belong to the same class ?*

---

* We have already said that every verb has a verbal adjective formed by adding *ing* to the verb, see page 28. We may here add that every verb has also a verbal noun formed in the same manner, and what is very remarkable, the verbal noun in *ing* may generally be substituted for the *name of the verb*, as we call the infinitive. Thus, Disliking means hating; Talking tires the lungs; Being implies vital action; Running makes us tired, &c. The French always render our verbal nouns in *ing* by their infinitive.

We have not arrived at any certain conclusion in regard to the accompanying word *to*. The most probable conjectures we have seen are, 1st, that it is the verb *do*, and when placed before any noun, it communicates an active meaning to it; thus, *eye* is a noun, *to* or *do eye* adds action to the noun; 2dly, that it is merely the termination *ed* in one of its various forms, and means *add*. *Our own conjecture* is, that *to*, before a verbal noun, is what Murray calls the preposition, and its meaning the same as when placed before any other noun, and this meaning, Mr. Tooke says, is the *end* or *object* (of action.) Such sentences as the following will we think support our conjecture.

Be desirous to excel (that is of excelling.)
Be anxious to improve (for improvement.)
Be quick to hear, slow to speak.

That is,

Be desirous	the end of being so	excellence
Be anxious		improvement
Be quick		to hear
Be slow		to speak

If placing *do*, the name of action, before a noun, makes a verb of that noun, what will those who deny that *Be* is an active verb, reply, when we tell them that *be* often performs the same *active* duty ascribed to *Do*. Thus, *befriend, behead, becalm, becloud, belie, bespeak*, &c. &c.

I wish (*what?*) *to excel* (*excellence*)
I fear (*what?*) *to die* (*death*)
I hope (*what?*) *to live* (or *life*)
I expect *to see* a stranger* (*the sight* of a stranger
I love *to walk* (*walking*)
I prefer *to ride* (*riding*)
I abhor *to tell* a lie (*telling* a lie)
I propose *to reform* grammar (*reforming* grammar)
I refused *to prepare* (*preparing*)
I omitted *to go* (*going*)
I contrived *to enter* (*entering*)
I regretted *to go* (*going*)

The monitor will teach the pupil that in the following examples the verbal noun appears to be rather the *cause* than the *object* of the preceding verb. The word *for* means "*the cause*" in our language, and was once more frequently used before this kind of verbal noun than it is at present. Thus I study *for* to learn, I stop *for* to rest, are the same as I study for learning, I stop for resting, or I study *the cause* (of studying) to learn; I stop, *the cause* (of stopping) *to rest*, or *rest*, or *resting*. Therefore the pupil must carefully consider whether the verbal noun be the *cause* of the action expressed by the preceding verb. But if TO be, what Mr. Murray calls a preposition, meaning *end* or *object*, as we hinted in a previous note, there is no need of the *for* or *cause*, for glory is as much the *end* and *object* of dying as it is the *cause*.

men die to obtain glory
racers run to gain the prize
lamps burn to give light

---

* Verbal nouns and adjectives, as they always express action, must have *objects* as their verbs have.

misers save to grow rich
ladies smile to show their teeth
beauties talk to attract attention
cowards boast to prevent fighting
rain falls to fertilize the ground
rulers watch to enforce the laws
ambition stoops to rise
religion invites to save us
Fayette fought to free us
virtue weeps to see vice
medicine sickens to heal us
affliction wounds to bless us

Having learned the manner of forming the *past* tense, the pupil must next become familiar with the *persons*. Let him then tell the *tense*, *number* and *person* of the verb in the following sentences. The monitor may hint to him that the *tense* may be determined by its having or not having *ed* ; the *number* may be determined by the number of the agent ; if the agent mean but one person or thing, the verb is singular ; if the agent mean more than one the verb must be plural also. To find the *person* consider whether the agent is speaking, or spoken to, or spoken of. The adjectives I, thou, he, she, it, we, ye, you, they, would be a good guide, but they and their noun are seldom both expressed at the same time. Ask also which is the agent, which is the object, their gender and number, and what the *adjective* qualifies.

thou *lovest* money
he *picks* fruit
they *call* help
the Lord *loveth* virtue
I *feared* the lion
thou *wastedst* time
ye *wanted* courage
sorrow *clouds* the brow
joy *delights* the heart
they *moved* rocks
thou *findest* work
he *counts* dollars
books *contain* instruction
thou *provedst* the fact

she *hopeth* success
it *discourages* us
pride *precedes* a fall
dangers *threaten* children
I *possessed* wealth
you *admired* beauty
we *disapproved* the conduct
passion *creates* crimes
charity *hopeth* all things
poverty *needeth* aid
she *married* him
he *punished* his son

In the following sentences the agent and verb are both in italicks. The verbs admit of no variation,* whatever be the person, and so far retain their primitive form.

ye *children be* grateful
be grateful ye *children*
be ye grateful *children*
ye *children love* God
love God, ye *children*
children love ye God?
thou *wretch expect* death
John open the door
boys stop your noise
stop your noise *boys*
the *Lord keep* us
the *Lord bless* us
thy *kingdom come*
thy *will be* done
( )*give* us our bread†
( ) *forgive* our sins
we( ) *go* to the king
go we ( ) to the king
permit ( ) him to go
let ( ) him (*to*) go‡
let ( ) her (to) die

* The grammarian will perceive that these sentences are meant to exhibit our ideas of what is called the *imperative mood* by Dr. Lowth and his followers. We do not wish to preserve any anomalies, or we should present a few such imperatives as this, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," &c. where their indicative 2d person is retained.

† The parenthesis means that the noun agent is understood. In this case it is *father*.

‡ The word *to*, which usually precedes the *name* of the verb, is always omitted after *let*; or to speak more correctly, some verbs in our language, of which *let* is one, take the verbal noun or infinitive after them without needing the assistance of the word *to*.

leave her to die
let ( ) them love
forbid ( ) them to love
let ( ) us* see
suffer ( ) us* to see
assist ( ) us* to rise
let ( ) us* to rise

In the following exercises, the simple or varied form of the verbs may be used. It is not necessary for the monitor to attempt to explain the meaning of *if*, farther than to say it is an old verb which means *give* or *grant*. *Whether* is an adjective. *Though* is from an old verb, and means *allow* or *grant*. The agent and verb are in italicks. Let the monitor omit no question that ought to be asked in this or any other exercise.

if I *(speaker) love*
though thou *(hearer) hate* or *hatest*, I ( ) forgive thee
if thou ( ) *hate* or *hatest*, I forgive thee
grant thou ( ) *hate* or *hatest*, I forgive thee
if he *John fear* or *fears*
if she *Mary work* or *works*
if it *(thing) fail* or *fails*
if we *(speakers) please*
if ye *(hearers) nod*
if they *(boys) learn*
though he ( ) *suffer* or *suffers*
whether† *John lives* or *dies*

---

* *Us* points out the persons let, suffered, assisted. We are aware that some grammarians who reject the imperative mood as useless, parse it differently. Thus, "Be grateful, ye children," is, they say, an abbreviation for "I wish ye children to be grateful;" "The Lord keep us," means "We pray the Lord to keep us," &c. *Be* and *keep* being the name of the verb. We think this unnecessary and incorrect, though plausible.

† *Whether*, a compound adjective, qualifies *event* understood in this and the following sentence.

whether *Sarah live* or *die*
provided* she ( ) *repent* or *repents*

There are a few other words which admit of either the simple or varied verb, but these are the most common.† The past tense is used *with* these words the same as without them.

In the following exercises the only peculiarity is in *the place of the agent*. The monitor should remark that when a question is asked the agent generally follows the verb.

love I ( ) fame ? love we ( ) glory
lovest thou ( ) life ? love ye ( ) wine ?‡
loves she ( ) books ? loved we ( ) play ?
lovedst thou ( ) thy friend ? loved ye ( ) war ?
loves it ( ) sugar ?
loved they ( ) money ? love they ( ) grammar ?
love all men their enemies ?
fear bad men a future state ?
feel the rich for the poor ( ) ?
drives humility a coach and six ( ) ?
drinks the man wine or water ?
falls the leaf ? tells John the truth ?

We often avoid this mode of expression by using the verb *do*. Thus, for "love all men ?" we say "do all men love ?"

---

* *Provided* is a verbal adjective, and, in this sentence, qualifies *condition* or whatever *is* provided.

† These examples illustrate the composition of what has been called the *subjunctive mood* by some grammarians.

‡ It is remarkable that, in their anxiety to create moods, grammarians have never thought of an *interrogative mood*. "Love ye," with a period after it, is in the *imperative* mood, but "love ye ?" with the mark of a question after it, is left by them in the plain *Indicative* mood, the mood which they say, "simply indicates or declares a thing," although it would puzzle most of them to tell what a question indicates except it be curiosity in the interrogator.

making *men* the agent of *do*, and *love* the name of the verb, *to* being omitted, as it generally is after the verb *do*?*

As the past tense of irregular verbs is variously formed, all the irregular verbs in our language are arranged in the following table with the verbal adjectives formed from them. It must be recollected that *every* verb has an adjective formed from it by adding *ing*, and *all regular verbs* have another formed like their past tense by adding *ed* to the present tense. All the irregular verbs in the following table have the adjective in *ing* and some have that in *ed*, but besides these, they have an irregular adjective which is inserted in the table.

Irregular verbs, like all anomalies, are exceedingly troublesome to learners. Most of them originated in blundering carelessness, and had grammarians endeavoured to remove such irregularities, they would have done some good: but, instead of such useful service, their first labour was to consecrate and confirm all the perversions which they found actually existing, and thus they prevented our language from righting itself, as it would have done to a considerable degree, if it had been left wholly to analogy, free from the fetters of arbitrary rules, established on such irregular precedents; for there is a constant effort on the part of children and foreigners, and all the ungrammatical to restore uniformity; which effort is so well backed by reason, that it would doubtless prevail but for the despotick authority of written grammar.

With the view of inducing influential writers and speakers to set the example of banishing iregularities from the verbs, we shall present them in the following distributions.

First, verbs which already have both a regular and irregular form. *The irregular form is printed in italick type that it may be avoided.* Where the past tense is regular, there is a regular adjective in *ed* also, but it was thought unnecessary to insert it.

The monitor in examining the pupil in the following table of irregular verbs will ask,

---

* We have already remarked, some suspect the word *to* to be the verb *do*, *d* being changed into *t*, as was often the case before our orthography was absurdly *fixed*.

What is the irregular past tense of *awake* ?
What is the irregular adjective ?
What would be the regular form of the past tense ?
What would be the regular adjectives ?

Ask each of these questions at every verb.*

Present tense.	*Regular past.*	*Irregular past.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
awake	awaked	*awoke*	R†
bend	bended	*bent*	*bent*
bereave	bereaved	*bereft*	*bereft*
build	builded	*built*	*built*
catch	catched	*caught*	*caught*
chide	chided	*chid*	*chid* or *chid-*
cleave *(to adhere)*	cleaved	*clave*	R [*den*
clothe	clothed	*clad*	*clad*
crow	crowed	*crew*	R
dare	dared	*durst*	R
deal	dealed	*dealt*	*dealt*
dig	digged	*dug*	*dug*
dwell	dwelled	*dwelt*	*dwelt*
freeze	freezed	*froze*	*frozen*
gild	gilded	*gilt*	*gilt*
grave	graved	*graven*	*graven*
gird	girded	*girt*	*girt*
hang	hanged	*hung*	*hung*
hew	hewed	*hewn*	*hewn*

* For further directions see the end of the table.
† The R indicates that there is no irregular adjective.

Present.	*Regular past.*	*Irregular past.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
knit	knitted	*knit*	*knit*
load	loaded	*laden*	*laden*
mow	mowed	*mown*	*mown*
saw	sawed	*sawn*	*sawn*
shape	shaped	*shapen*	*shapen*
shave	shaved	*shaven*	*shaven*
shear	sheared	*shorn*	*shorn*
shine	shined	*shone*	*shone*
show	showed	*shown*	*shown*
shrink	shrinked	*shrunk*	*shrunk*
slay	slayed	*slew*	*slain*
sow	sowed		sown
spill	spilled	*spilt*	*spilt*
strive	strived	*strove*	*striven*
strow	strowed	*strown*	*strown*
*strew**	*strewed*	*strawed*	*strawed*
swell	swelled	*swollen*	*swollen*
thrive	thrived	*throve*	*thriven*
wax	waxed		*waxen*
work	worked	*wrought*	*wrought*
wring	wringed	*wrung*	*wrung*

Secondly, verbs which might be restored to analogy or rendered regular without offering much violence to grammatical usage. *We*

* Both the regular and irregular form of this verb should be disused; it means the same as *strow*, and is even pronounced in the same manner. The same remark will apply to *shewed* for *showed*.

have put the proposed past tense in italicks, because its reception is not yet general amongst grammarians, although the ungrammatical, by far the majority of every nation, constantly use it.

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjectives.*
beseech	*beseeched*	besought	besought
bleed	*bleeded*	bled	bled
blow	*blowed*	blew	blown
choose	*choosed*	chose	chosen
cleave (to split)	*cleaved*	cleft *or* clove	cloven
cling	*clinged*	clung	clung
creep	*creeped*	crept	crept
draw	*drawed*	drew	drawn
drive	*drived*	drove	driven
drink	*drinked*	drank	drunk
feel	*feeled*	felt	felt
flee	*fleed*	fled	fled
fly	*flied*	flew	flown
fling	*flinged*	flung	flung
forsake	*forsaked*	forsook	forsaken
grow	*growed*	grew	grown
hear	*heared*	heard	heard
keep	*keeped*	kept	kept
know	*knowed*	knew	known
lay	*layed*	laid	laid
lie	*lied*	lay	lain

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjectives.*
leave	*leaved*	left	left
lose	*losed*	lost	lost
pay	*payed*	paid	paid
ring	*ringed*	rang	rung
rise	*rised*	rose	risen
say	*sayed*	said	said
see	*seed*	saw	seen
shake	*shaked*	shook	shaken
shoe	*shoed*	shod	shod
sing	*singed*	sang	sung
sink	*sinked*	sunk *or* sank	sunk
sleep	*sleeped*	slept	slept
slide	*slided*	slid	slidden
sling	*slinged*	slung	slung
slink	*slinked*	slunk	slunk
smite	*smited*	smote	smitten
speak	*speaked*	spoke	spoken
speed	*speeded*	sped	sped
spend	*spended*	spent	spent
spin	*spinned*	span *or* spun	spun
spit	*spitted*	spat	spitten
spring	*springed*	sprang	sprung
steal	*stealed*	stole	stolen
stick	*sticked*	stuck	stuck
sting	*stinged*	stung	stung
stink	*stinked*	stank	stunk
stride	*strided*	strode	strid *or* stridden

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjectives.*
strike	*striked*	struck	stricken
sting	*stinged*	stung	stung
swear	*sweared*	swore *or* sware	sworn
swim	*swimmed*	swam *or* swum	swum
swing	*swinged*	swung	swung
teach	*teached*	taught	taught
tear	*teared*	tore	torn
tell	*telled*	told	told
think	*thinked*	thought	thought
throw	*throwed*	threw	thrown
weave	*weaved*	wove	woven
weep	*weeped*	wept	wept
win	*winned*	won	won

Thirdly, verbs whose *regular* form would so offend the delicate ears of modern grammarians, that there is little prospect of any reform. We shall, however, insert the proposed regular form, that the eye of the rising generation may gradually become accustomed to it, and be prepared for its adoption.

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
abide	*abided*	abode	abode
bear	*beared*	bare *or* bore	born *or* borne
begin	*beginned*	began	begun

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
bid	*bidded*	bade *or* bid	bid *or* bidden
bind	*binded*	bound	bound
bite	*bited*	bit	bitten
break	*breaked*	broke	broken
breed	*breeded*	bred	bred
bring	*bringed*	brought	brought
buy	*buyed*	bought	bought
come	*comed*	came	*come*
do	*doed*	did	done
fall	*falled*	fell	fallen
feed	*feeded*	fed	fed
fight	*fighted*	fought	fought
find	*finded*	found	found
give	*gived*	gave	given
go	*goed*	went	gone
have	*haved*	had	had
hide	*hided*	hid	hidden
hold	*holded*	held	holden
lead	*leaded*	led	led
make	*maked*	made	made
meet	*meeted*	met	met
rend	*rended*	rent	rent
ride	*rided*	rode	rid
run	*runned*	ran	run
seek	*seeked*	sought	sought
send	*sended*	sent	sent
shoot	*shooted*	shot	shot

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
sit	*sitted*	sat	sitten
stand	*standed*	stood	stood
take	*taked*	took	taken
tread	*treaded*	trod	trodden
wind	*winded*	wound	wound
write	*writed*	wrote	written

Fourthly, verbs which have no change of termination, yet answer every purpose of speech as well as those that have the affix *ed*. It is to be regretted that this simplest form is not the most common, but as *ed* has become the general *past* termination, perhaps it ought to be added to these verbs also. We put it in italicks.*

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
beat	*beated*	beat	beat *or* beaten
burst	*bursted*	burst	burst
cast	*casted*	cast	cast
cost	*costed*	cost	cost
cut	*cutted*	cut	cut
eat	*eated*	eat or ate	eat *or* eaten

* Unnatural as some of these regular past tenses may appear, nobody could mistake their meaning; and as the ungrammatical mass of society are already prepared to adopt them, nothing can be more desirable than a willingness on the part of literary men to conform to the popular usage, which in this case is certainly reasonable and correct.

Present tense.	*Proposed regular past tense.*	*Irregular past tense now in use.*	*Irregular verbal adjective.*
hit	*hitted*	hit	hit
let	*letted*	let	let
put	*putted*	put	put
read	*readed*	read (*pronounced* red)	read
rid	*rided*	rid	rid
set	*setted*	set	set
shed	*sheded*	shed	shed
shred	*shreded*	shred	shred
shut	*shutted*	shut	shut
split	*splitted*	split	split
spread	*spreaded*	spread	spread
sweat	*sweated*	sweat	sweat
thrust	*thrusted*	thrust	thrust

There are a few irregular verbs, viz. *be* or *am*, *have*, *do*, *may*, *can*, *shall*, *will*, *must* and *ought*, which will be considered more particularly hereafter.

The monitor may now, as a further exercise upon the irregular past tenses and adjectives, say somewhat as follows, using the proposed *regular* past tense, to draw from the pupil the *irregular* past.

I *rise* now and I *rised* yesterday. did I ?

I *shake* now and I *shaked yesterday*, did I ? &c. &c.

Then to obtain the irregular adjective, say,

I have *rised* often, have I ?

I have *shaked* often, have I ? or some similar question, suited to draw the desired answer from the pupil. This exercise will be of essential service to the mind of the monitor as well as the pupil, especially if she will attempt to put an *object* after every verb, thus,

The wind shakes the house to day, and it *shaked* the house yesterday ?

I have *shaked* a rod to-day, and I have often *shaked* one, have I ? &c. &c.

We shall now consider a few irregular verbs more particularly, because upon their supposed peculiarities has been erected a system of *moods* and *tenses* as foreign to the structure of the English language, as they are useless and perplexing.

Verbal name or noun, TO BE.

Present Tense.		*Past Tense.*	
Singular.		*Singular.*	
1. I	am *or* be	1. I	was *or* were
2. thou	art *or* be	2. thou	wast *or* wert
3. he, &c.	is *or* be	3. he	was *or* were
Plural.		*Plural.*	
1. we	are *or* be	1. we	were
2. ye *or* you	are *or* be	2. ye *or* you	were
3. they	are *or* be	3. they	were

In the two tenses above given are the fragments of five verbs, viz.

1. *Am*, meaning to *exist* or retain one's vitality.
2. *Be*, meaning *to live* or hold a certain state of being.
3. *Are*, *art*, meaning to *air* or breathe.
4. *Is*, meaning to *stand*.
5. *Were*, *wert*, and *was*, to *inspire* or inspirit. (*See Appendix.*)

Let the child now tell the tense, number and person of the verb in the following exercises. He should also tell the number and person of the noun, which is qualified by the adjectives in the sentence. The noun in every case is understood.

I *was* sick	I *am* better
he *is* rich	we *are* worse
we *were* proud	they *are* moral
she *was* fair	thou *wast* lame
it *is* clear	she *is* poor
thou *art* wicked	he *was* rich
they *were* brave	it *was* his
ye *are* foolish	ye *were* right
you *are* vain	you *were* wrong

In the following exercises the pupil must point out the *objec* of the verb, which may be distinguished by its being in italicks

men are *fools*	knowledge is *power*
hope is an *anchor*	honesty is the best *policy*
death is a *glutton*	truth is not *falsehood*
fidelity is a *virtue*	God is our *creator*
Adams was a *patriot*	the Bible is a *treasure*
peace was a *blessing*	stars are *suns*
soldiers are *slaves*	planets are *worlds*
boys are not* *men*	patience is a rare *virtue*
wealth is not *content*	conscience is our *friend*
thou ( ) art *Peter*	fame was his *ruin*
we ( ) were *sinners*	death is our *doom*
the gospel was good *news*	action is our *duty*
	kings were *clowns*
	merchants were *princes*

* The monitor need not undertake to explain the word *not*, which will be explained hereafter. It is put here to show that the *object* of the verb *to be* does not necessarily "mean the same thing as the *agent*."

In the following questions, the *agent* is placed *after* the verb, but in other respects the structure of the sentences is not altered. The *object*, if there is one, is in italicks.

am I a *man* ?
is John a *slave* ?
was Brutus an *assassin* ?
were your parents poor ?
are apples dear ?
art thou not a *villain* ?
wast thou ( ) merry ?
is pride a *sin* ?
are oysters alive ?
is passion forbidden ?
was glory forgotten ?
were chains prepared ?
is cash ready *money* ?
is ignorance a *crime* ?
is gluttony a *vice* ?
are misers miserable ?
were ye ( ) the *rogues* ?
wast thou ( ) the *leader* ?

In the following sentences *be* is used in its simplest form, and it is remarkable that of the five verbs which compose this under consideration, *be* is the only one which is used in making a request, or giving a command. The verb and agent are in italicks. Ask the pupil what the adjective qualifies, for this will point out the agent.

father, *be* merciful
men, *be* charitable
boys, *be* attentive
winds, *be* still
be quick, my *son**
be diligent, *girls*
be brave, *soldiers*
be thou (hearer) quiet
be he ( ) our guide
be it ( ) their comfort
be she ( ) followed
be this *order* obeyed
be we ( ) ready
be ye ( ) willing
be they ( ) hanged

* How could the son *be quick* if *be* does not express action ? The imperative mood (as Murray calls it) of *be* and of all other *neuter* verbs, always expresses action in the plainest manner.

The word *if* in the following sentences has been explained on page 40. It will be seen that *be* is used with all the persons. This use of *be*, however, although the simplest and most proper to be retained, is going into disuse, and perhaps it is better that it should go, for it is desirable to have only *one* form although it be irregular. Thus we say,

if I ( ) *be* quick, *or*, if I *am* quick.
if ye ( ) *be* cold, *or*, if ye *are* cold.
if thou ( ) *wert* lame, *or*, if thou *wast* lame.
if she ( ) *be* kind, *or*, if she *is* kind.
if it ( ) *be* true, *or*, if it *is* true.
if he *be* false, *or*, if he *is* false.
if she *were* pale, *or*, if she *was* pale.
if thou *be* tall, *or*, if thou *art* tall.
if it *were* safe, *or*, if it *was* safe.
if man *were* or *was* immortal.
if hope *be* or *is* unreasonable.
if men *be* or *are* the judges.
if warriors *be* or *are* tigers.

In connexion with the verb *to be*, we cannot forbear to insert a few exercises to show the use of the verbal adjectives after it. In consequence of a misconception of the nature and use of these adjectives, and the supposition that the verb *to be* did not express action, Mr. Murray has constructed his Passive Voice of verbs.* The verbal adjectives are in italicks, the other adjectives in meaning and use will nearly correspond, but are not allowed to form a *passive voice !* The monitor must ask Who is ? Penelope is *how* ? What does *loved* qualify ? &c.

Penelope is *loved* hope is *extinguished*
Penelope is beloved hope is extinct
his arm is *injured* the work is *completed*
his arm is hurt the work is complete

* For further remarks see the Appendix.

men are *degenerated*
men are degenerate
the clergy are *exempted*
the clergy are exempt
the man is *convicted*
the man is guilty
I am *alarmed*
I am afraid

In the following examples, another verb is put for *be* and its tenses, but although the meaning is the same, there is said to be no passive voice in the case!

I am convicted
I stand convicted
the man is dead
the man has died
the man lies dead
he is worried
he feels worried
merit is rewarded
merit gets rewarded
lying is inexcusable
lying can not be excused

Even the verbal nouns *to be* and *being* sometimes have an object. In the following exercises there are two objects, that which belongs to *be* is in italicks.

you suspect me to be a *fool*
I know you to be a *knave*
we wish them to be *friends*
they compel us to be *foes*
thou tellest him to be a *christian*
he advises you to be his *pattern*
the danger of being a *sinner*
the hope of being an *officer*
death, being a *rest*, was pleasant
hope, being an *anchor*, saved us
wealth, being an uncertain *possession*, is worthless
virtue, being an eternal *good*, is invaluable

Verbal Name, TO HAVE.

Present Tense.		*Past Tense.*	
Singular.		*Singular.*	
1. I	have	1. I	had
2. thou	have *or* hast*	2. thou	had *or* hadst
3. he, she, it	have *or* has *or* hath	3. he, she, it	had
Plural.		*Plural.*	
1. we	have	1. we	had
2. ye *or* you	have	2. ye *or* you	had
3. they	have	3. they	had

To *have* means to *hold* or *possess*.

In the following exercises let the pupil tell the tense, number, and person of the verb, what is its agent, and what its object.

he has money	we have pens
I have children	thou hast need
she hath pride	has he a father ?
they had honour	hath he a wife ?
thou hadst reason	hadst thou a book ?
ye have hope	had ye wisdom ?
we had time	have I friends ?
you had fear	had ye enemies ?
trees have sap	men had hearts

* *Hast* is a contraction of *havest*, *has* of *haves*, *hath* of *haveth*, and *had* of *haved*.

if I have power
if we have love
if she have prudence
if thou have *or* hast patience
if ye had courage
if thou had *or* hadst mercy
if boys had industry

In the following exercises the monitor must be careful to ascertain what the verbal adjective qualifies. The adjective and the noun it qualifies are in italicks. Ask, "*who* has? *what* have you? *how* have you the lesson?"

I have *learned* the *lesson**
I have the *lesson (how?) learned*
men have *abused reason*
men have *reason abused*
men possess *reason abused*
boys have *read books*
boys possess *books read*
I have *caught* a *bird*
I have *killed* a *fox*
we have *seen* a *picture*
he has a *jacket cut* short
he had his *head broken*†

---

* I have learned, is a *past* tense with most grammarians, but *I have* is present, and *learned* only expresses the condition of the *lesson*, not of the learner. I *retain corrected* views; I *keep refined* company; I *adopt improved* opinions; I *handle polished* weapons, and many others which might be mentioned are just such *past* tenses.

† "I had broken" is the old *pluperfect*, that is, *more-than-perfect* tense!

the winds had *made* a *noise*
the sun had *scattered* the *clouds*
the tyrant has *suspected treason*
she had *filled* her *apron* full*
poor John had *nothing said* (*or* said nothing)
thou, Abba, hadst a good disposition

The *Object* qualified by the verbal adjective after *have* is often understood, as,

I have perished
you have fallen
they have been

In all such cases it is plain that the verbal adjective qualifies either the *agent* or else an *object* meaning the same thing as the agent. The latter is preferable, "what do I have or hold?" answer, *myself*. "In what state or condition do I hold myself?"

I have (myself) perished
you have (yourselves) fallen
they have (themselves) been (or lived)
suns have ( ) set
plans have ( ) failed
marble has ( ) lied
the child has ( ) slept
the noise ( ) has ceased

---

* To find what class *full* belongs to, ask "what was *full* as well as what was *filled*?"

Verbal Name, TO DO.

Present Tense.		*Past Tense.*	
Singular.		*Singular.*	
1. I	do	1. I	did
2. thou	do, do*est or* dos*t*	2. thou	dids*t*
3. he, she, it	do, do*es*, do*th or* do*eth*	3. he, she, it	did
Plural.		*Plural.*	
1. we	do	1. we	did
2. ye *or* you	do	2. ye *or* you	did
3. they	do	3. they	did

In the following exercises ask the tense, number and person of the verb, and its agent and object. If there be an adjective after it, ask what it qualifies. For adjectives ending in *ly*, see page 24.

thou dost mischief
he does finely (i.e. *like fine doers)*
they did generously
we did good
I do sums
she doth needlework
thou didst harm
It does badly
they do better
we do famously
ye did your duty
he did the deed
if thou did *or* didst the action

if thou do *or* dost an injury
if he do *or* does hard work
that man doth much business

In the following sentences the *object* of the verb *to do* is a verbal noun. Thus, in the sentence *I do go*, the question is what do I do ? answer *go*. *Go* is the name of the action I perform, and as all verbs express action, *do* (which is the common name of all kinds of action) may be placed before any verbal noun.* The verbal noun is in italicks and has an object after it.

men do *love* money
we do *make* books
kings do *honour* flatterers
books do *benefit* men
crimes do *produce* shame
impunity does *harden* sinners
gratitude does *become* us ( )
he did *provoke* a fight
we do *abhor* disputes

---

* Murray calls *I do love*, the present tense of the verb *love*, and *I did love*, the past tense of it. *Love* he calls *present*, and *did love* should be called the *present-past tense*, which will be a match for the paradoxical plu-perfect, and paullo-post-future of grammarians.

The custom of using *do* instead of other verbs is universal in our language.

He *falls* as I *do*.
He *talks* as fools *do*.
He sleeps as sluggards do.
He dies as beasts do, &c. &c.

Whether this substitution of *do* for neuter verbs militates against the idea of their inactiveness is worthy of consideration. No doubt the verbal noun is understood after do. "He falls as I do *fall*, &c. in which and similar cases the *do* does not appear to be the *to* which usually precedes the verbal noun, or, as Murray calls it, the infinitive.

they did *forsake* truth
glory does *desert* the living ( )
cold does *congeal* water
heat doth *melt* ice
water did *dissolve* salt
Cæsar did *cross* the Rubicon
you did *do* a favour
he did *be*. I do *be* a slave

Verbal Name, MAY.

Present Tense.		*Past Tense.*	
Singular.		*Singular.*	
1. I	may	1. I	might
2. thou	may *or* may*est*	2. thou	might *or*
3. he, she, it	may	3. he, she, it	might*est*
Plural.		*Plural.*	
1. we	may	1. we	might
2. ye *or* you	may	2. ye *or* you	might
3. they	may	3. they	might

May expresses *liberty* or *ability*.

In the following sentences, require the tense, number and person of the verb. *May* usually expresses liberty or ability *to do* something; and hence it has no *objects* but such as are names of verbs or verbal nouns. The verbal noun is in italicks, and sometimes has an object after it.

I may *(what ?) go*
I might *stay*

they may *rail*
truth may *fail*
pride might *fall*
fear may *kill* men
learning may *raise* poverty
children may *have* amusement
I may *see* many years
men might *love* their fellows
come what *come* may*
may we *go* to the play ?†
might John *have* owned a house ?
may God *grant (to)* you peace
might I *have* saved his life ?

Verbal Name, CAN.

Present Tense.		*Past Tense.*	
Singular.		*Singular.*	
1. I	can	1. I	could
2. thou	can *or* can*st*	2. thou	could *or* could*st*
3. he, she, it	can	3. he, she, it	could
Plural.		*Plural.*	
1. we	can	1. we	could
2. ye *or* you	can	2. ye *or* you	could
3. they	can	3. they	could

* That is, "come thing, what thing may come ;" the first *thing* being the agent of the first *come*, and the second *thing* the agent of *may*.

† See remarks on verbal name and the word *to*, page 36.

Can means *to know, to know how, to be wise.*

If *can* ever mean *to be able* as it is usually explained, it is probably because "knowledge is *power*." *Cunning*, which still means *knowing*, is a verbal noun and adjective, derived from *can ; to ken*, which means *to know*, is a varied spelling of the same word. In the following sentences, *can* means "*to know how*,"* and governs a verbal noun, which is in italicks.

I can *read*
I know (how) *to read*†
I am able *to read*
thou canst *speak*
if thou can or canst *write*
he can *predict*
we could *foresee*
we know (how) to *foresee*
we were able to *foresee*
ye can *mistake*
thou couldst *go* alone
they can *make* money
she can (not)‡ *answer*

---

* We have seldom allowed ourselves to refer to analogous cases in other languages, but we cannot forbear alluding to the French custom of using their verb *savoir, to know*, as we do our verb *can ;* as, Je *sais* guérir, I *know how* to cure, or I *can* cure. Je ne *saurois* vous le dire, I can not tell it to you. And their verb *savoir* like our verbs *can* and *know*, takes the verbal name, or as it is called the Infinitive Mood, without *to* or any other preposition before it. We do not put *to* after *know* without the intervention of *how*, which is explained in another place.

† Other verbs are also inserted to show that there is nothing peculiar in the verb *can*, and no reason for attaching it to the following verbal noun, and calling both words a *Potential mood*. *How* will be hereafter explained.

‡ *Not* is usually but improperly joined to *can*. *Cannot* is not a verb, for we can not say, *I cannot, thou cannotest, he cannots*, &c. *Not* will be hereafter explained.

he can (not) *fly*
You could (not) *shoot*
it can (not) *be* a child
patience can *overcome* obstacles
virtue could *stand* undaunted

Verbal Name, SHALL.

Present Tense.	*Past Tense.*
Singular.	*Singular.*
1. I shall	1. I should
2. thou shall *or shalt**	2. thou should *or*
3. he, she, it } shall	3. he, she, it } should [shouldst
Plural.	*Plural.*
1. we shall	1. we should
2. ye *or* you shall	2. ye *or* you should
3. they shall	3. they should

* *Shall* and *should* in the second person singular of both tenses are very seldom used at present.

Shalt has no reference to futurity, except so far as an obligation implies a *future duty* or *action*. The obligation is *present*, and there are other verbs which might have been selected for the *sign* of the future tense as well as *shall*, as, to *desire*, *hope*, propose, intend, expect, prepare, think, and, indeed, every other verb which, like *shall*, expresses intention or obligation. Even *am* expresses the same sort of *present* obligation to do some *future* action, for we say *I am to go*, *he is to preach*, &c. The only reason we can give for calling *shall go* a future tense exclusively, is, that *shall* governs a verbal noun without the intervention of the preposition *to*, but this is not the case with *sceal* in Saxon, whence our word is derived. *Shall* is now seldom or never used with any other than a *verbal* noun

Shall means *owe* or *ought*, or *to have an obligation.*

In the following exercises the verbal noun, which is the object of *shall*, is in italicks, and has sometimes an object of its own.

---

after it, but this was not the case formerly, for Chaucer, who lived about the year 1400 says, "The faith I *shall* to God," for, The faith I *owe* to God, and this was *a common* use of the word in his time.

Should is undoubtedly *shalled*, and it is called the *past* tense of shall. We do not believe that *should* expresses past time any more than *shall* expresses future time, but those who *do* think so, are bound to explain how it is that a word expressing futurity can have a *past* tense.

If I should see him what shall I say to him ?
Should I go or stay ?
Should the sky fall we should catch larks.

In these and a thousand other sentences *shall* may be put for *should* without altering the meaning.

It may not be out of place here to mention that what is called the *present* tense often appears to express future time. In the following sentences it implies not only *present* but *continued* action.

He *teaches* musick for a livelihood.
He *writes* for the Daily Papers.

In the following sentences the *present* tense expresses *futurity* as fully as *shall* does.

Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow *we die.*
Next week I *spend* with you, and then I *depart.*
When *do* you sail ? I *sail* next August.

If it be said that *shall* may be understood before all these verbs but *do*, we may allow it for the sake of asking whether *except, intend, propose,* &c. may not as well be understood, and are not therefore as well entitled to be called "*signs of the future tense?*" But we have so far bowed to *usage*, that idol of grammarians, as to allow a present and past tense of verbs, with the mental reservation that we only allow two *forms* of the verb without any reference to *time.* See note on page 30.

thou shalt *die*
thou art obliged *to die.**
men should *love* goodness
he should *have* done his duty
thou shouldst *be* punished
money should *be* used
grammar shall *be* reformed
grammar is obliged *to be* reformed*
grammar needs *to be* reformed
truth shall now *triumph*
shall usage *vanquish* propriety ?
should honest men *fear* to die ?

Verbal Name, TO WILL.

Present Tense.

Singular.

1. I will
2. thou will *or* wilt *or* will*est*†
3. he, she, it } will *or* wills *or* will*eth*

Plural.

1. we will
2. ye or you will
3. they will

---

* We have shown that verbal adjectives have objects as their verbs do.

‡ *Wilt* and *would* are contractions of *willest* and *willed*. and should be discarded from the language, as having nothing but deformity to recommend them. So with *shalt* and *should*,

Past Tense.

Singular.

1. I would *or* will*ed*
2. thou would, would*st or* will*ed or* [will*edst*
3. he, she, it } would *or* will*ed*

Plural.

1. we would *or* will*ed*
2. ye *or* you would *or* will*ed*
3. they would *or* will*ed*

Will expresses *volition* or the *act of willing*, or it means *to determine*.

---

which have driven their originals *shallest* and *shalled* off the ground.

After what has been said under the verb *shall* about a *future* tense it will be unnecessary to say much in regard to *will*. *I will* is allowed to be *present*. I *willed* or *would* expresses a finished act of the will, but unless some other word is added, no *definite* time is implied. If, however, *I willed* express a *definite* time, what sort of a *definite* time must it be, if it can be modified by the numerous words and phrases which express time, as *I willed* or *would* now, never, yesterday, this moment, to-morrow, forever, &c. &c. If *I will go* is future, so is, I wish to go, I purpose, propose, intend, determine, conclude, &c. to go. *Will* is an active verb and has other objects than verbal nouns. It is true that a distinction is made in the *use* of the original verb and the contraction, but there is no difference in their meaning. I can *will* a thing easier than I can *do* a thing. If *will*, therefore, expresses no futurity when alone, it can acquire no such meaning when joined to what Murray calls the present tense of other verbs, for although we may allow the paradox that two negatives make a positive, we are not prepared to allow that two presents make a future. Every verb placed after *will* becomes a verbal noun, and is the *object* willed.

The monitor must not omit to ask every question relating to the words in the following sentences, as he has been previously directed. The *object* of *will* is in italicks, and sometimes has an object of its own.

I will *write* a book
men will *be* fools
he will *make* money
he wills his *property*
God willeth our *good*
he willed, (and)* it was done
who wills should execute†
thou wilt *be* a king
thou willest to *be* a great man.
wouldst thou John *have* ( ) retreated ?
willedst thou I should perish ?†
will you *go ?* will he *come ?*
I will *death* (to) murderers
I will *love* my parents
thou wouldst not *kill* him !
if thou wilt *have* no mercy
wilt thou *consent* to hear ?
would they *prefer* to ride ?
we would *be* absent

Verbal Name, MUST.

Must is derived from the same Saxon word as *May*, and its meaning was originally the

---

* *And*, and *to*, in a subsequent sentence, will be hereafter explained.

† (The man) who wills should execute. *Execute* and *perish*, the fourth sentence below, are the objects of *should*.

same, although now it seems to imply *necessity* or *constraint* rather than *liberty.*

Must is the only verb in the English language, which, in spite of grammarians, has retained its primitive simplicity, having no variation on account of tense, number, or person; and yet there is nothing indefinite or obscure in its use.

Present and Past Tense.

Singular.	*Plural.*
1. I must	1. we must
2. thou must	2. ye / you must
3. he / she / it must	3. they must

In the following exercises, the verbal noun is in italicks, and sometimes has an object of its own. Let the monitor endeavour to find whether *must* is used in a past or present sense.

I must not *lie.* I may not *steal*
we must not *reveal* secrets
we may not *slander*
teachers must *be* willing to learn
pains must *have* been taken
many ( ) must *have* perished
patience must *produce* relief
I must *go* (yesterday or never)*
life must *have* an end

* The words in the parenthesis will be hereafter explained. If should, could and would are always *past*, *must* can in all cases be put in their stead. We repeat our conviction that no verb in itself expresses time of any sort.

Verbal Name, OUGHT.

Ought has the same origin as the verb *to owe*, and its meaning is the same,* viz. *to have an obligation.* In its structure it the most nearly resembles *must*, having no variation of tense, and only one of person.

Present and Past Tense.

Singular.		*Plural.*	
1. I	ought	1. we	ought
2. thou	oughtest	2. ye *or* you	ought
3. he, she, it	ought	3. they	ought

In the following sentences the verbal noun is in italicks.

we ought to *be* good
she ought to *save* her money
thou shalt not *kill*
thou oughtest not *to kill*
thou shalt *retire*
thou oughtest to *retire*
men ought *to have* repented
John ought *to have* done his work yesterday
Ought he to *have* delayed it ?
if sin ought to *be* punished
what ( ) ought sinners to *do* ?
ought they ( ) to *repent* ?

---

* *Ought* is another spelling of *owed*, and being both present and past has an advantage over its kinsman. *Shall*, it must be recollected, has the same meaning as *ought*, and to show this, one or two examples are given in the exercises.

CONTRACTIONS, ANOMALIES, &c.

After taking from the mass of words which compose our language, all the nouns, adjectives and verbs, there will be only about *two hundred* words left. These words have given no little trouble to grammarians, who, without a careful examination of their origin, meaning, and perhaps contraction or corruption, have endeavoured to class them. It was not until John Horne Tooke, the foe of grammatical as well as political thraldom, attempted their explanation, that any thing like a just idea of their nature, origin, and meaning was conceived.

He satisfactorily proved that they were perfect nouns, verbs or adjectives, disguised, perhaps, by a different orthography, by composition, or by contraction, but still retaining their original character, meaning, and use. His explanation, however, of these mysterious words, has not yet given rise to an improved classification of them, and our modern grammars continue to repeat the old nonsense about adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and

interjections, without even hinting that any additional light has been thrown upon the subject.*

We have abridged the whole essay of Horne Tooke so far as it relates to these words, and have besides endeavoured to assist the pupil in a practical application of such illustrations as are given. We have even gone farther, and ventured to supply such deficiencies as we discovered while attempting to adapt the new theory to practical purposes.

N. B. The words are disposed somewhat alphabetically, that they may be conveniently found, and at the end of the catalogue is a condensed table of them, with their meaning, and a reference to the page where they are more particularly explained.

AND.

And is the Anglo Saxon verb *anad*, *to add*, and the word *add* may always be substituted for *and*.

Two *and* two are four.
Two *add* two are four.
John *and* Jane are a fine couple.
John *add* Jane are a fine couple.

It is unnecessary to add more examples, for every page is full of them. It may be remarked, however, that as *and* means to *add*, and one of the *buts* to *superadd*, this *but* may be found by putting *and* in its place.

---

* Some remarks upon the old division of these words into classes may be found in the Appendix.

"Eneas no langar suffer wold sic wraith procede,
And of the bargane maid end, *without* delay."
Douglas.

So in every other case adduced under the word *but, to superadd*, which see.

AS.

As means the same as *it*, or *that*, or *which*.

"She glides away under the foamy seas
As swift *as* darts or feathered arrows fly."

That is, "She glides away (with) *that* swiftness (with) *which* feathered arrows fly."

Als was once used where we put the first *as*, but *als* is a contraction of *all* and *as*.

The above couplet is found in Douglas, thus.

Sche ——————
Glidis away under the fomy seis,
Als swift as fedderit arrow flies.

Which means,

"With *all that* swiftness (with) *which* a feathered arrow flies."

Such is the account of *as* given by Horne Tooke, but some *conjecture* that *as* means *like*, and is an adjective qualifying the thing compared. We give a few examples to illustrate this conjecture.

"Men shall be *as* Gods."

That is, "Men shall be *like* Gods," *like* is an adjective qualifying *men*.

"I did *as* I was ordered."

That is, I did (the thing or action) *like* I was ordered, *like* qualifying the thing done.

So with Horne Tooke's own example,

"She glides ——
As swift *as* feathered arrow flies."

We have already said that the termination *ly* of our adjectives is a contraction of *like*. We should say then for the modern version of Douglas,

"She glides swift*ly like* feathered arrow flies."

The *als* of Gower may be rendered by putting *all* before *swiftly*. *All* and *full* are often thus placed before adjectives (or, as others call them, *adverbs*) in *ly*; as, all lovely, full merrily.

We prefer Horne Tooke's opinion. (See *So*.)

SO.

So, Mr. Tooke says, is derived from the Gothick *sa* or *so*, and still retains its original meaning of *it* or *that*. He gives no illustration, but we will endeavour to, the better to illustrate both opinions of *as*.

As I bade John *so* he did.
John did *that* (action) *like* I bade.
That I bade John, *that* he did.

"I am not *so* sick *as* I was.
I am not sick *like that* I was.
I am not *that* sick *that* I was.

ALSO.

All-so is composed of *all* and *so*, meaning *all that*.

"She is generous and prudent *also*."

She is generous and *all that* prudent. That is, "She is as prudent as she is generous. *All* and *that* refer to *she*.

AT. (*See To.*)

ABOUT.

About seems to be the French *à bout*, and is nearly equivalent to *at the end*, *limit*, or

boundary. Hence also our verb *to abut*, *to end at*, and the noun *butt*, *a boundary* or *mark*.

"He flew *about* the cage."
He flew, the limit (of his flying) the cage.

"He is somewhere *about* home."
He is somewhere *in the limits of* home.

"What is he about?"
In the limit of what (business) is he?

AFTER.

After, Anglo-Saxon *æfter*, is an adjective the second degree in comparing *aft*, which is still retained as a noun in nautical language.

The meaning of "*fore* and *aft*," is at the *front* and *back*, or at the *bows* and *stern* of a vessel. The *after part* means the *hinder part*.

"Christmas comes *after* Thanksgiving."

After, instead of being a *preposition*, is an adjective qualifying Christmas; and Thanksgiving is the agent (or nominative) of comes understood.

"Christmas comes *after* Thanksgiving *comes*."

Our children come *after* we (come.)
Our children come *after* us (come!)

The latter is one of a thousand cases we could name, where, to build up the system of *cases*, prepositions or something else must be made to take care of the old forms which will not bend to the new rules.

We have an amusing instance in the word *methinks* or *me-thinks*, which most modern grammarians call an *interjection!*

ALONG.

Along, that is, *on long*, or *on length*.

"And these words said, she streyght her *on length* and rested awhile."

That is, "And these words said, she stretched herself *along* and rested awhile."

Endlong was once used in this sense; thus,

"She slough them in a sodeine rage
Endlonge the borde as thei ben set."
Gower.

"*Endlang* the coistis side our nauy rade."
Douglas.

The verb *to long*, though not to be found in Walker's Dictionary, is in common use, and like *incline*, and similar words, is applied to express those acts or operations of the mind which correspond with those of the body. Its primary meaning is to lengthen or stretch out, as the body does to attain a distant object.

Long was sometimes used for *along*, and both were once used in a sense somewhat different from that now received.

"It *is long* of yourself, for you were the party that commended him to me."

"But if it *is alonge* on me,
Or else if it *be longe* on you,
The soth (truth) shall be preued now."
Gower.

Do not these examples indicate the origin of our verb *belong?* Is not *long* or *length* used in the sense of *all* or *entire* or *whole*, and when we say a thing *be*longs to us, do we not mean that it *is all* ours, or ours *exclusively?*

ATHWART.

Athwart is from the Anglo-Saxon verb *athweorian*, and means *wrested, twisted, curved.* Hence the English words *thwart, swerve* and *veer.*

AMONG, AMONGST.

Among, amongst, or as they were formerly written, *emonge, amonge, amonges, amongest*

are derived from the Saxon verb *mengan*, and mean *mixed* or *mingled*.

And tho she toke hir childe in honde
And yafe it souke, and euer *amonge*
She wepte, and otherwhile songe
To rock with her child aslepe.—*Gower*.

That is,

"And though she took her child in hand,
And gave it suck, and ever *mixed*
She wept and sang, &c."—*Gower*.

"And ioye *meynt* with bytternesse."

Meynt for mingled.

Chaucer says, "Yf thou castest thy seedes in the feldes, thou shouldest haue in mynde that the yeres bene *amonges*, otherwhyle plentuous and otherwhyle bareyn.

AROUND. *(See Round.)*

ABOVE. *(See Upon.)*

AGAIN.

We find nothing satisfactory in regard to this word, and can only conjecture that it means *one gain* or *gain one*, equivalent to *add one*.

I will go *again* (add one *time*.)
I will go once more (one *more* time)

Its expressing but *one* repetition of the action is in favour of this explanation of *a*, but whether *gain* be our present verb and noun, or the verbal adjective *gane* or *gone*, or *given*, contracted into *gin*, or something else, is not so evident. We have selected the most probable conjecture. *Against* is spelled *agayne* in some ancient authors, but *we* cannot reconcile the use and meaning of our *again* with that of *against*.

AGAINST.

Against is supposed to be the verbal adjective of some Anglo-Saxon verb, and to mean *met*, *opposed*, or something equivalent.

He ran *against* the wall.
He ran the wall *being opposed* or *met*.

Horne Tooke founds this opinion upon the use of analogous words in the kindred languages of the north of Europe, but he might have added that *against* generally means *opposite* or *opposed to*; as,

The wind is *against* us.
The wind is *opposed to* us.
Dover is over *against* Calais
Dover is over (the water) *opposite* Calais.

AMID, AMIDST.

Amid and *amidst* are merely *in* or *on mid* or *midst*. *Mid* and *midst* are still preserved as nouns, and mean the same as *middle*; as, mid-day, mid-summer, in the midst, &c.

ATWIST.

Atwist is a verbal adjective, and means *twisted*.

AWRY.

Awry is a verbal adjective, and means *writhed*.

"Howe so his mouthe be comely,
His worde *sitte* evermore *awrie*."—*Gower*.

ASKEW, ASKANT, ASKANCE.

These words mean *wry*, *crooked*, *oblique*, and are verbal adjectives.

AFOOT.

Afoot means *on foot*, and the latter is as often used.

ASIDE.

Aside means *on side.*

"On syde he bradis for to eschew the dynt."—*Douglas.*

ABACK, ABREAST, AFRONT, AHEAD, ACROSS, ASTRIDE, APART, ABOARD, &c.

These words mean *on* back, *on* breast, &c.

ABROAD.

Abroad is on broad.

"But it no was so sprede *on brede*
That men myghte knowe the sede."—*Chaucer.*

ADAYS, ANIGHTS.

"But this I see *on daies* nowe."—*Gower.*

"Now on daies thou shalt finde
At nede, few frendes kinde."—*Id.*

"And thus *on nights* revelen."—*Id.*

AFIRE.

On fire is still commonly used.

ALIVE.

On life, or *in life.*

"For prouder woman is there none *on lyve.*"—*Chaucer.*

ALOFT.

"The golde tressed Phebus hygh *on lofte.*"
"And fra thine (thence) hye up *in the lyft* agane
It glade away and tharein did remane."—*Douglas.*

In the Anglo Saxon *lyft* is the *air* or *clouds*. Thus "In lyfte cummende" coming in the clouds. From this word come *loft* (still used for a high room by riggers and sail makers) *lofty*, *to luff*, to bring a vessel up to the wind or air, and *lee* and *leeward*, the side the wind or air blows towards. *To lift* also comes from the same source.

ANEW.

"Was it honest ane godly divine wycht
With ony mortall straik to wound in ficht?
Or yit ganand the swerd loist and adew
To rendir Turnus to his brand *of new*.—*Douglas*.

ASLEEP.

"Apoun the earth the uthir beistis al
Full sound *on slepe* did caucht thare rest be kind."
Douglas.

"In these provynces the fayth of Chryste was all quenchyd and *in slepe*."—*Fabian*.

ASUNDER.

Asunder is a verbal adjective and means *separated*.

"In virtue and holy almes dede
They liv*en* all, and never *asunder wende*
Till deth departe*th* hem (them.)"—*Chaucer*.

In this example the past tense has three different terminations.

"And tyl a wicked deth him take,
Hym had *lever asondre* shake."—*Rom. of the Rose*.

Asunder is originally from the Anglo Saxon *sond*, which means *sand*, a name very applicable to decomposed rocks, and proverbially applied to express the least degree of connection. *Lever* is the second degree of comparison of *lief*.

ASTRAY.

Astray is a verbal adjective from the Ang. Sax. verb *strægan*, and means *strayed*, *strawed*, *scattered*, *dispersed*.

The words to stray, to straw, to strow, to strew, to straggle, to stroll, all proceed from *straw*. So does *straw-berry* so remarkable for its disposition to *stray*.

"Reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not *strawed*."—*Matthew* xxv. 24.

ADRIFT.

Adrift is from the Ang. Sax. verb *drifan* or *adrifan*, and means drifted or driven.

"And quhat auenture has the hiddir *driffe*?—*Douglas*.

"The vessel is *adrift*." The vessel is driven or drifted.

AGHAST.

Aghast is supposed to be derived from the Gothic verb *agisan*, and means *made to fear and tremble*. Our word *ague* is probably from the same source.

AGO.

Go, ago, ygo, gon, agon, gone, agone, are all used indiscriminately by our old English writers for *gone* the verbal adjective of *go*.

"But nethles the thynge is *do* (done)
That fals god was soone *go* (gone)
With his deceite, &c."—*Gower*.

"But soth is sayed, *go* sithen many yeres,
That feld hath eyen, and wode hath eres."—*Chaucer*.

That is, "*gone* many years since."

"For euer the latter ende of joye is wo,
God wotte, wordly ioye is soone *ago* (gone)"—*Chaucer*.

"To horse is all her lusty folk *ygo*."—*Chaucer*.

"Thou wost thy self, whom that I love parde (verily)
As I best can, *gon* sythen long while."

"Thou thy selfe, that haddest habundaunce of rightwisnesse nat longe *agon*."—*Boecius.*

———"A marchant. *gone* is many a yere,
Me taught a tale, which ye shullen here."
Man of Lawes tales.

"Of such examples as I finde
Upon this point of tyme *agone*,
I think for to tellen one."—*Gower.*

Some old fashioned people in New-England still use the word *agone.*

Long-ago is merely *long gone* (*time* understood.)

AWHILE.

Awhile is *a time.* Whilst was formerly written *whiles*, meaning *time that* or *which.*

"She died, my Lord, but *whiles* her slander lived."
Shakspeare.

While is from the same Anglo Saxon word as *wheel*, and figuratively means time. To "walk a while," or "take a turn," still have the same meaning.

ADIEU.

From the French *à dieu*, which means *to God*, the word being used at parting, when we commend our friends to God.

ANON.

Anon means *in one*, instant or moment being understood. *An* is the Anglo Saxon for *one*, and *on* means *in.*

It is this *on* which has been corrupted into *a* in such words as *aday, anight, along, abroad, aback, alive, amid, aright, away*, &c.

In the word *anon* the *on* comes last but it has not always been so.

"Thus say*and*, scho (she) the bing ascendis *on ane*."
Douglas.

Gower and Chaucer frequently write it *in one*.

ALIKE.

Alike is a compound adjective, and perhaps means *one like*.

"They are *alike*,"
They are *like one* (person.)

"He is *alike* generous and prudent," means that his generosity and his prudence are uniform, equal, or *like one* (quality.)

Alike with this meaning is the same word as *only*, but there appears to be a difference in their application. "He is *only* generous and prudent," seems to imply either that he has no other good qualities, or that he alone possesses these.

It is very possible that *a-like* may be *on like*, as *alive* is *on life*.

Like is always an adjective when uncompounded.

AY, AYE, YEA, YES.

Ay and *yea* or *yes*, probably came to us from the French *aye*, which means *have* or *ayez*, which has the same meaning. *Yea* is nearly the French pronunciation of *yez*, and *yes* is the pronunciation those unacquainted with French would give it, as has been done in the word *oyez*, which means *hear*, but which the crier of the courts pronounces *o-yes* to the great enlightening of the audience.

But although we trace these words so directly to the French, the existence of similar words in all the northern languages of Europe leads to the conclusion that they are of Anglo Saxon origin. The Saxon verb *agen* or *ayen*, to own, will account for them, for *to own* includes *to have*, and *have* a thing and *own* a thing, are often equivalent terms.

Ay or *aye* and *yes*, then, mean *have*, and when by the word *yes* we assent to a request,

we mean *have it*, that is, have what you request.

Some ancient phrases evidently authorize this conclusion. Chaucer says,

> " Her *most* joye was ywis,
> When that she yafe and sayd *have this*."

That is, when she *gave* and said *yes*.

This is Horne Tooke's derivation of these words, but an ingenious etymologist has derived them from *oui*, the French word for yes, and which was anciently spelled *ouis*. What *oui* comes from we are not informed, but its most obvious etymon is *ouir* the French for *hear*, of which *oyez* just mentioned is a tense. The teacher must decide for himself.

ALONE, ONLY.

Alone, is *all-one*, and *only* is *one-like*.

> " So came she to him prively,
> And that was, where he made his mone,
> Within a gardeine, *all* him *one*."—*Gower*.
>
> " The sorowe doughter, which I make,
> Is not *all onely* for my sake,
> But for the bothe, and for you all."—*Id*.

We sometimes hear even now such expressions as the following.

> " To live or die is *all one* to me."

Alone and *only* are always adjectives.

I live alone
I live single
I live unattended
I live unmarried
I' only live

} are parallel expressions.

I only live', by placing the emphasis on *live*, is made to mean I *barely* live, but in this case, *one*, the lowest of nnmbers, is merely used as a diminutive to express a small degree of life.

ALSO. (*See* So, *after the word* As.)

ALWAYS.

Always is *all ways*, *in* being understood. *Gate* means *way*, and is now often used for *way* by the Scotch as it was formerly by the English. Hence *always* in our oldest authors is often spelled *algates*.

"I will *carpe* of kings, that conquered full wide,
That dwelled in this land, that was *algates* noble, &c.
Percy's Ballads.

Carpe, in this case, means merely *to speak*, without implying censure.

ALREADY, ALMOST.

Al-ready is *all-ready* and *al-most* is *all-most*.

"He is *already* well."

He is well all ready (to do something.)

"He is *almost* well."

He is all well. He is *most all* well.

Most all, or *almost* means *nearly all* or *most part of all.*

AUGHT, OUGHT, NAUGHT, NOUGHT.

The Anglo Saxon *hwit* is our *whit*. The adjective *a* was often written *o*; hence *aught* or *ought* mean *a whit*, or *o whit*. So *naught* or *nought* are *na whit*, or *no whit*.

Ought, *a whit*, must not be mistaken for *ought*, the verb before *explained*. (See the word *Not*.)

BUT.

But, by a faulty orthography has got to mean two things entirely different, and it is an

ignorance of this fact which has puzzled lexicographers and grammarians when attempting to explain the word.

But comes from *Botan* which means *to boot*, or *superadd*, and from *Be-utan* which means to *be out* or *except* or *leave out*.

Sometimes the old writers observed the proper difference of orthography.

"Eneas no langar suffer wald sic wraith procede
Bot of the bargane maid end, *but* delay."—*Gower*.

That is, "Eneas would no longer suffer such wrath to go on, *Superadd*, he ended the contest *without* delay."

It is common in New-England to hear men say "I will give you my horse for yours with ten dollars *to boot*," that is, *in addition*.

"*Bot* sen that Virgil standis *but* compare."—*Gower*.

Superadd, since that Virgil stands *without* comparison.

"You must answer that she was brought very near the fire, and as good as thrown in, or else that she was provoked to it by a divine inspiration. *But*, *But* that another divine inspiration moved the beholders to believe that she did therein a noble act, this act of hers might have been calumniated."

Donnes Biathanatos.

Here *but* is used with both its meanings close to each other. For the first *but*, which should be spelled *Bot*, read *superadd*, and for the second, *be out* or *except*.

Speed. "She has more hairs than wit, and more faults than hairs, *but (superadd)* more wealth than faults."

Laun. "Why, that word (*but*) makes the faults gracious."

Old Play.

In the following sentences *but* means *boot* in every case.

"You pray, *but* it is not that God would bring you to the true religion, *but* that he would confirm you in your own. You confer places, *but* it is that you may confirm your erroneous doctrines. You consult the originals, *but* you regard them not, when they make against your doctrine or translation."

Chillingworth.

NOTE. Murray does not number *but* amongst his prepositions, *but* it often is as much so as any word he has classed under that name.

"He has nothing *but* impudence to recommend him."

In parsing "be out impudence," *we* should call *impudence* the agent of *be*, and *out* an adjective qualifying *impudence*.

BY, BETWEEN, BETWIXT.

By is the Ang. Saxon verb, *beon*, *to be*, and our ancestors wrote it indifferently *be* or *by*.

"Damville *be* right ought to have the leading of the army, but *bycause* thei be cosen germans to the admirall, thei be mistrusted."—1568.

We have already hinted that *with* sometimes means *be*, and *without* means *be out*, which we contract into *but*.

"He was slain *by* a sword."
He was slain *with* a sword.

"Kenwalcus was warreyd (worried) *with* the king of Britons."

By used synonymously with *for*. "The which *by* a long time dwelled in warre."—*Fabian*. xlv. (See the word *Ever*.)

By used synonymously with *in* or *during*. "To whom the fader had *by* hys lyfe commytted him."—*Ib*. lxxii.

By used synonymously with *through*. "He made Clement *by* hys lyfe helper and successour."—*Ib*. lv.

Of is used for *by* in the following lines from Gower.

"But that arte couth (could) thei not fynde,
Of which Ulisses was deceived."

BETWEEN, formerly written *twene*, *a twene*, *by twene*, is composed of *be* and *twegen*, or, as we have preserved it, *twain*, whence *twin* another spelling of the same word.

BETWIXT, by Chaucer spelled *bytwyt*, is *be* and the Gothick *twos*, *two*, in Anglo Saxon *betweoks*, *betweox*, *betwux*, *betwyx*, and finally *betwyxt*.

"Thy sonne and thou mote hange fer *atwynne*,
For that *bytwyt* you shall be no synne."—*Miller's Tale.*

That is, "Thy son and thou must hang far apart, *the cause being* that no synne shall be betwixt you."

Between and *betwixt* always relate to *two* things, and should never be used when we speak of more than two.

BEFORE, BEHIND, BELOW, BESIDE and BESIDES, are merely the same verb *be* added to the nouns *fore* (front,) *hind* (back,) and *low* and *side*, which are in common use.

BENEATH means the same as *below*. It is the same verb *be* with the noun *neath*, which noun, although itself disused, has left us *nether* and *nethermost*. *Neath* is from the Anglo Saxon *neothe* and its meaning something like our word *bottom*. *Nadir*, which in astronomy means that point of the heavens under or opposite to our feet is the same word *nether*, *d*, as is very common, being put for *th*.

"Into his *nether* empire neighbouring round."
Paradise Lost.

"Earth with her *nether* ocean."—*Ibid.*

"In yonder *nether* world."—*Ibid.*

The British House of Commons was once called the nether house of parliament. The lower mill stone is by millers called the *nether* stone. The *low* lands between Germany and France are called the *Nether*lands.

UNDER is *on-neder*, and means nearly the same as *beneath*. It is a noun adjective when used as what Murray calls a preposition, and it is often as plainly an adjective as its opposite *upper*. The *under* side, an *under* price, an *under* officer, &c. are familiar expressions.

BEYOND.

Beyond is *be* with the Anglo Saxon *gone*, which is from their verb *go*, and means passed. So that beyond a place means, "be passed that place" *or* "be that place passed."

BY AND BY.

By-and-by is *be-and-be*. "When are you going?" *be-and-be;* that is "*after a few things be*" (or have been.)

BECAUSE.

Because was once written *by cause;* and as *by* is the verb *be*, *by cause* means *the cause be* or *is*.

DURING.

During means *lasting* and comes from the old verb *dure*, *to last*.

"And all his luste, and all his besy cure
Was for to loue her, while his lyfe mai *dure*."—*Chaucer*.

"How should a fyshe with outen water *dure*?"—*Troylus*.

"This affection *dureth* in everyche trew herte."
Testament of Loue.

"Desyre hath long *dured* some speaking to haue.—*Ibid.*

Endure is the same verb, the *en* being prefixed instead of postfixed. *En* is the Anglo Saxon termination of what Murray calls the infinitive mode, the same as our *name* of the verb

DOWN, ADOWN.

Down, which, from the Anglo Saxon *dufen*, is supposed to have gone through the following changes, *duven*, *duvn*, *dun*, *don*, *down*, means *sunk*, *depressed*, *deep* or *low*, and is a verbal adjective. *Dufen* is the past participle of *dufian*, which means to sink, to dive, to dip.

DOUBTLESS.

Doubtless is a compound word, meaning *doubt-dismissed*. This termination *less* is very common in our language, and comes from the same Anglo Saxon verb as *else*, *lest* and *unless*, which see in their proper places.

ELSE.

This word *else*, formerly written *alles*, *alys*, *alyse*, *elles*, *ellus*, *ellis*, *ells*, *els* and now *else*, is the Ang. Sax. verb *alesan*, *dismiss* or *except*.

"The Soudan ther he satte in halle;
He sent his messagers fast with alle,
To hire (*her*) fader, the kyng.
And sayde, how so hit (*it*) ever bi falle (befall,)
That mayde he wolde clothe in palle
And spousen hire with his ryng.

And ALLES I swere, withouten fayle,
I chull (*shall*) hire winnen in pleye battayle,
With mony an heih lordyng."
Warton's History of English Poetry.

"For what man that in speciall
Hath not him selfe, he hath not ELS
No more the perles than the shells."—*Gower.*

"Submit or *else* die," that is "*submit*, or *dismiss* (submission, that is, *without* submission) *die*."

ENOUGH.

In Anglo Saxon *genog* or *genoh*, a verbal adjective meaning *manifold*, *multiplied*.

The Ang. Sax. final *g* in *genog* is generally rendered in English by *gh* or *ch*, but sometimes by *w*. The Scotch pronounce the *gh* and *ch* gutturally, and in that respect more closely follow the original than we do.

EKE.

Eke is the Ang. Sax. verb *eacan*, to *add*.

"He seized the reins with both his hands,
And *eke* with all his might."—*John Gilpin.*

To *eke* out a thing is to lengthen it or add to it.

EXCEPT, SAVE.

Save is the verb still in common use.

"Forty stripes *save* one."
Forty stripes, *reserve* (ye) one.

Except may be used for *save*.

Except means *to take out*, and *save* means *to keep*, or *keep back*; and forty with one *taken out* or *kept back* will produce the same remainder, thirty nine.

The use of *save* affords Chaucer an excellent equivoque or pun, when, in the presence of his adversary the friar, he makes Sompnour say,

"God *save* you all, *save* this cursed friar."

Except comes to us from the Latin, *ex*, *out*, and *capere*, *to take*. *Outcept* was sometimes used by our old writers.

"I'ld play hun 'gaine a knight of any other county in the kingdome, *outcept* Kent."—*B. Johnson, Tale of a Tub.*

Outtake and *outtaken* were once in very common use also. We give one instance as it also illustrates the original meaning of *can* and the disregard of what is called the *case* of pronouns.

"There was a clerke, one Lucius,
A courtier, a famous man,
Of every witte somewhat he *can*,
Outtake that *hym* lack*eth* rule,
His own estate to guyde and rule."—*Gower.*

That is "Of every knowledge somewhat he *knew*,
Except that *he* lack*ed* method
His own estate to guide, &c."

EITHER, NEITHER.

Either is *other*, which is contracted into *or*. *Neither* is *no* or *not other*, and is contracted into *nor*.

Take *either* this *or* that book.
Take *or* this *or* that book.
Take this *or* that *other* book.
Take that *other or* this book.

Take *neither* this *nor* that book.
Take *nor* this *nor* that book.
Take *not* that *other nor* this book.

And yet our grammarians and lexicographers, and Walker among the rest, tell us that *either* is a pronoun meaning *each*, or *both*, and a conjunction, meaning, "*either* the one or the other." *Each* and *both* mean exactly the opposite of *either*, and the word *either* should be omitted in the definition of the *conjunction*, as he calls it.

Either, *neither* and *nor* are never plural, but mean *one of two* or *no one of two*.

EVER, FOREVER, NEVER.

Ever is a noun meaning *duration* or continuance. *Forever* is probably *fore ever*, that is, time ahead or time to come. This seems to us preferable to the common opinion that *forever* is composed of *for* and *ever*, because *for* always means *cause*, and we can not trace this meaning of *for* when it is placed before nouns of time.

"He will live *for* months."

For is not the cause of *willing*, *living*, or *months*.

"He will live months *fore* or to come."

During or something equivalent may be understood before months.

We are aware that this hypothesis is liable to the objection that we place *fore* before nouns of time, when past time is expressed, as,

"He lingered for months before he died."

But this only means that "he lingered months ahead of the time when he began to linger, and the sentence is an ellipsis or contraction similar to the following,

"He lingered months *after*, before he died."

After what? either the time when he began to linger or some other time known to the speaker.

Never is *not-ever* or *na-ever*, that is, *no-time*. "He is *never* sick," means "He is *at no time* sick." *(See Nevertheless.)*

FOR.

For is a Gothic noun meaning *cause*, and nothing else, although Dr. Johnson gives it

forty six meanings, and cites above two hundred examples to illustrate them.

Horne Tooke has shown that all the pretended *meanings* of *for* may be resolved into *one*, the word *cause*, and he tries the experiment upon the very examples adduced by Dr. Johnson. We can only give a few specimens of them. In the following sentence Johnson says *for* means "*in advantage of*."

"Shall I think the world was made *for* one,
And men are born *for* kings, as beasts *for* men."

That is, "Shall I think one (man was) *the cause* why the world was made, and kings *the cause* why men are born, as men are *the cause* why there are beasts."

Dr. Johnson's meaning in the following sentence is *notwithstanding*.

"*For all* his exact plot down was he cast from all his greatness."

That is, "He was cast down from all his greatness, *all* his exact plot (being) *the cause* (not of his falling, but of our supposing that he would not fall.")

"I come for to see you." I come, *the cause being* to see you. (See remarks on the Verbal name, page 37.)

For, used as a conjunction, according to Murray and others.

"We should be kind *for* heaven is kind to us."

We should be kind, *the cause being*, that heaven is kind to us.

For, in this case, means the same as *because*, which we have shown means *cause be*, or *the cause being*.

"*For as much as* the thirst is intolerable, the patient may be indulged the free use of water."

That is, The patient may be indulged the free use of water, *the cause being* as much, as the thirst is intolerable.

In this case *much* appears to be an adjective qualifying *for*.

For why.

"Away went Gilpin, and away
Went Gilpin's hat and wig;
He lost them sooner than before
For why, they were too big."

That is, *The cause why* he lost them sooner than before was, they were too big. In another stanza of the same ballad we have,

"And *for that* wine is dear,
We will be furnished with our own," &c.

For that means *cause that*, or *the cause*, or *because*, or *for why*. *Why* will be explained in its proper place.
(See remarks on *For*, under the word *Ever*.)

FOREVER. (*See* Ever.)

FORSOOTH, INSOOTH.

Sooth is an old word meaning *truth*. *For sooth* and *in sooth* then, mean *for truth* and *in truth*. From *sooth* is formed the adjective, *soothless*, i. e. *without truth*.

"Down, *soothless* insulter! I trust not the tale."—*Lochiel*.

FROM.

From is the Ang. Saxon noun *frum*, and means *beginning*, *origin*, *source*, *fountain*, *author*.

Thus the Ang. Sax. version of Matthew xix. 4, is "Ne rædd ge se the on *frumman* worhte, he worhte wærman and wifman." That is, "Have ye not read that *in the beginning* he created them male and female."

Figs came from Turkey.
Stars fall from heaven.
Icicles hang from trees.

Came expresses one kind of *motion*, and *falls* another. *Hangs* expresses *attachment*. *From* expresses the beginning of this motion or attachment.

Figs came, *beginning* Turkey.
Stars fall, *beginning* heaven.
Icicles hang, *beginning* trees.

"*From* morn till night the eternal larum rang."
Beginning morn, the eternal larum rang till night.

Dr. Johnson has given *twenty* different meanings of *from*, *twenty two* manners of using it, and about *seventy* examples of its use, all of which have this same single meaning, *beginning*. (*See the word* To.)

FORTH.

Forth is an adjective from the Latin *foris*, or, more nearly, the French *hors* (or, as originally spelled, *fors*,) meaning *out of doors*, *out side*.

"Againe the knight the old wife gan arise,
And said, sir knight, here *forth* lyeth no way."
Chaucer.

"I see no more, but that I am *forth done*
Myn herytage mote I nedes sell
And ben a beggar, here may I no longer dwell."
Frankeleyns Tale.

Done forth means *turned out of doors*.

"Need is I must sell my heritage and be a beggar."

FAIN.

Fain is the verbal adjective of the Ang. Sax. verb *fægnian*, and means *rejoiced*, *glad*.

"Na uthir wyse the pepyl Ausoniane
Of this glade time in hart wox wounder *fane*."
Douglas.

"Not otherwise the Ausonian people of this glad time wax or grow wondrous glad in heart."

FIE.

The Anglo Saxon verb *fian*, *hate* (*thou* or *ye*.)

FAREWELL.

Fare is a verb, and *well* an adjective. Fare is still used as a verb when we say "How fare you?"

HALT.

Halt is a verb and means *hold, stop*. *Hold* and *halt* are both from the Ang. Sax. verb *healdan*, meaning *hold*, which was once spelled *halt*.

"He leyeth downe his one (own) eare all plat
Unto the grounde, and *halt* it fast."—*Gower*.

"The gold which auarice encloseth,
But all to litell *hym* supposeth,
He let it neuer out of his honde
But gette hym more, and *halt* it fast."—*Ibid*.

IF.

If is merely the Gothick and Anglo Saxon verb *gifan* and means *give* or *grant*. It was formerly written with the *g* in our language.

"My largesse
Hath lotted her to be your brother's mistresse
Gif shee can be reclaimed; *Gif* not, his prey."
The sad Shepherd.

Give or *grant* she can be reclaimed, my largesse hath lotted her to be your brother's mistresse; *grant* she cannot be reclaimed, my largesse hath lotted her to be his prey.

"How will the weather dispose of you tomorrow?" "*If* fair, it will send me abroad; *if* foul, it will keep me at home."

That is, *Give* fair weather, it will send me abroad, *give* foul weather, it will keep me at home.

An was frequently used for *if* by old authors, and is still used, as "*An* it please your honour," the usual mode of addressing certain magistrates. *An* is the Anglo Saxon verb *anan*, which means *grant* or *give*.

"He must speak truth,
An they will take it, well. *If* not, he's plain."
Shakspeare.

If and *an* were once used indifferently.

"*Gif* luf be vertew, then is it leful thing;
Gif it be vice, it is your undoing."—*Douglas.*

Chaucer, in 1400, spelled it, *if*, *yeue*, *yef*, and *yf*; *u* in *yeue* is read as *v*.

"Yeue ye woll ought unto your son the king,
I am your seruaunt," &c.—*Chaucer.*

He spells the *undoubted* verb in the same manner.

"As largesse is to *yeue* (give) and spend,
And God alway ynowe her sende,
So that the more she *yaue* (gave) awaye,
The more ywis she had alwaye."—*Chaucer.*

"*Forgiff* me Virgil *gif* I thee offend."
Douglas. Preface to his Transl. of Virgil.

Gin is often used in some parts of Great Britain for *if* and *an*, and with propriety, for it is a contraction of *given*. In New England we sometimes hear uneducated people say, "I have *gin* it to him."

"If my daughter should have done soe, I would not have *gin* her a groat."—*Wycherly.*

"Then wi' his spear he turned hir owre,
O *gin* her face was wan!
He said, Ze are the first that eir
I wisht alive again."—*Percy's Reliques.*

ILL.

Ill is a verbal adjective from the Ang. Sax. verb *aidlian*, and means *sick* or *corrupted*.

"If you love an *addle* egge, as well as you love an *idle* head, you would eat chickens in the shell."—*Troylas and Cressida.*

Addle pated and addle brained are common expressions.

"You said that idle weeds are fast in growth."
Richard III.

"*Ill* weids waxes weil."—*Ray's Scottish Proverbs.*

Addle becomes *ail*, as *idle* becomes *ill* by sliding over the *d* in pronunciation.

IN.

The origin and precise meaning of *in* and *out* have not yet been ascertained. At any rate, the words are adjectives and are thus compared.

In, inner, inmost.

Out, outer *or* utter, outmost *or* uttermost.

INDEED.

In deed needs only to be separated.

INSTEAD.

Instead is from the Ang. Saxon *in stede*, *stede* meaning *place*.

"All thyng hath tyme and *stede*."—*Gower*.
"Furth of that *stede* I went."—*Douglas*.

Stead is still preserved in such compounds as *bedstead, homestead, roadstead,* &c. and is also used alone, as,

"I went in his *stead*."

Stead is corrupted into *step* in such words as *step*-mother, *step*-father, *step*-child, which mean *instead of a father, mother* and *child*.

Dr. Johnson, in his *great* Dictionary, says "*stepmother* is a woman who has *stepped* into the place of the true mother!"

JUST.

Just is an adjective from the Latin, and means *ordered, directed, commanded*.

"He is just gone."

He is gone *as directed*.
He is gone *direct*, or *as directed*.

"He is a *just* man."

He is an *ordered* or *directed man*, that is, an *orderly* man. An ordered or directed man is one who has orders or directions, but it means also a man who follows those orders or directions, as a *disordered* man is one who does *not* follow orders or precepts prescribed, and a *misdirected man* is one who errs.

A *direct* line is the *straightest* (that is, *strictest*) and *shortest* that can be drawn between two points. It is in this sense that we apply *just* to a man's course of conduct.

LEST.

Lest is the Anglo Saxon verb *lesan*, *to dismiss*, already mentioned under the words *unless* and *else*.

Lose, lost, loss,
Loose, unloose, loosen, unloosen,
Lessen,
Lease, release, both noun and verb,
Less and least,

all come from the same verb, and have the common meaning of *dismission* or *separation*.

"But yet *lesse* thou do worse, take a wyfe,
Bet is to wedde, than brenne in worse wyse."
Chaucer.

LIEF.

Lief is the verbal adjective of the Anglo Saxon verb *lufian*, to love, and always means *loved* or *beloved*.

We only use *lief*, and that rarely, but this adjective was once compared thus, *lief*, *lever*, *lievest*.

"And let no thyng to the be *leef*
Whiche to an other man is grefe."—*Douglas.*

"When that bokes were *lever*,
Writing was *beloved* ever
Of them that weren vertuous."—*Gower.*

"Thre pointes which I fynde
Ben levest unto man's kynde."—*Gower.*

That is "*are most beloved.*"

"I *had* as *lief* not be as live to be in awe."
Shakspeare.

Not to be, I *hold* as *loved* as to live, &c.

LO.

Lo is the verb *look* contracted.

"*Looketh!* Attyla, the great conquerour,
Dyed in his slepe, with shame and dishonour."
Chaucer.

"*Loke!* eke howe to kyng Demetrius
The king of Parthes, as the boke sayth us,
Sent him a payre of dyce of golde in scorne."

Look may in any case be put for *lo.*

LIKE. (*See* Alike.)

LIKEWISE, OTHERWISE.

(In) *Like-ways* or *wise.* (In) *other-ways* or *wise.* These words ought never to be united.

MUCH, MORE, MOST.

These words were originally *mo*, *moer*, *moest*, but *mo* is disused, and *moer* and *moest* have become *more* and *most.*

Much, which has taken the place of *mo*, being a diminutive of it. *Mo* became *mokel*, then *mykel*, *mochil*, *muchel*, (still used in Scotland) *moche* and lastly, *much.*

"And yf it be fayre a mans name be *eched* by *moche* folkes praysing, and fouler thynge that *mo* folke not praysen."
Testament of Love. Chaucer.

Eched is probably our word *eked*, extended.

"A lytel misgoyng in the gynning causeth *mykel* errour in the end."—*Ibid.*

"Yf the sonne (sun) be so *mokel* as men wenen (suppose or *ween*) or els yf it be more than the erth."—*Ibid.*

The Anglo Saxon verb *mawan*, to *mow* (as we do grass) had *mowen* for its participle, afterwards contracted into *mown*. Leaving off the termination *en*, *mow* was left, and was the name given to what was *mown*. From denoting a heap of hay it soon was applied to any other *heap*. To express a large quantity of any thing the noun was used as an adjective, and *mow* money, *mow* praise, &c. became common. *Mow* was then contracted into *mo* and received the regular comparative terminations *mo-er* and *mo-est*.

Much, *more* and *most* then are *always* adjectives, even when used to assist in the comparison of other adjectives.

He is *wiser* than she. *Wiser* qualifies *he*.
He is *more wise* than she.

No one will pretend that *more* or *wise* qualifies *she*.

He is *more* than she.
He is *more* than *wise*, he is *profound*.

More in these cases is allowed to qualify *he*. "He is *more*." In what quality is he more? He is more wise.

He is *more wise* than she.
He is *wise*, *more* than she.
He is *large*, *greater* than she.
He is *deep*, *farther* than she.
He is *bad*, *worse* than she.

In all these cases which we consider exactly parallel, both adjectives qualify *he*.

He is worse shaped than she.
He is better bred than she.
He is finer souled than she.

If worse, better and finer, are *adverbs* because another adjective comes after them to show in what respect *he* is *worse*,

better, or *finer*, we hesitate not to assert that every adjective in the language is an adverb, for it may be placed in the same circumstances.

"Gold is *much more heavy* than lead."

Gold is *much*. Much is equivalent to *a great deal*.

"Gold is *a great deal more heavy* than lead."

Deal is governed by *by* understood. *Much*, which, we have seen, means *a heap*, may be governed in the same way, if any one refuses to consider it an adjective. The accumulation of adjectives in this way is no uncommon occurrence.

He is a *very honest looking* rogue.
This is a *good light blue* colour.

Neither of the adjectives singly expresses *every* quality of the noun, but are *they the less perfectly well formed* adjectives on that account?

MOREOVER. (*See* Over.)

MAYBE, MAYHAP.

It may be, it may hap or *happen.*

"And whatsoever else may *hap* to night
Give it an understanding but no tongue."—*Shakspeare.*

PERHAPS.

Per means *by*, and *haps* means *happenings.*

The *happes* over mannes hede
Ben honged with a tender threde."—*Gower.*

Belike was once employed even by Milton, for *perhaps*. *Like* in this case is the word *luck*, and *be* we have said is the same as *by*.

Antony. "*Belike* (by luck or chance) they had some notice of the people how I had moved them."

Shakspeare. Jul. Cæsar.

METHINKS.

Methinks and *methinketh* are relicks of those times when pronouns and verbs had no distinction of persons. *Me thinks* must be parsed as *I think* is.

Under this specimen of pronouns *unpersoned* we cannot refrain from remarking that the verb *is* was once used with all the pronouns.

"Since my love died for me to day
Ise die for him tomorrow."—*Percy's Ballads.*

"He was a wight of high renowne,
And *thouse* but of a low degree."—*Percy's Ballads.*

So with *hes, wese, yese,* &c. It is worthy of remark that *is,* in the first extract is what is called the *future tense* now a days.

NAUGHT, NOUGHT, (*See* Aught.)

NOT, NO, NAY.

Horne Tooke appears to elude an inquiry into the origin of these words, and only hints that they mean *unwilling.* We have already ventured to call *not* a contraction of *naught,* which, he says, means *no whit.*

He is *no whit* man.
He is *not* man.

These phrases have the same meaning.

Nay, I suspect is the same as *no* or *na,* as it is written and pronounced in some dialects of English ; or, perhaps, *nay* may be *ay,* with the negative before it, for as *ayez* means *have,* and our *ay* is the first part of *ayez,* so *n'ayez* means *have not,* and the three first letters may be our *nay,* afterwards contracted into *na* and *no.* (*See* Aught.)

NEITHER, NOR, (*See* Either.)

NEVERTHELESS.

Nevertheless, spelled also *na-the-less, nathless, ne-the-les, nocht-the-les, not-the-less,* and even *never-the-later,* is a compound whose parts may be easily separated.

"He is imprudent *nevertheless* I love him."

He is imprudent, I love him *not* the less. *Not* is a contraction of *nought* or *naught*, and means *no whit*, and *the less* qualify *whit*. *Never* means *no ever*, that is *no time*, and *no*, *the*, and *less*, qualify *ever*. *Whit* and *ever* are governed by *by* understood. (*See* Ever.)

NEEDS.

Need-is. It was anciently written *needes* and *nede is*.

Certes, for *certain is*, is an instance of the same kind.

"And *certaine is*, quod she, that by gettyng of good, be men *maked* good."—*Boecius*.

" I have graunted that *nedes* good folke *moten ben* myghty."
Testament of Love.

That is, *need is* good folks *must be mighty*.

" The consequence is false *nedes* the antecedent mote ben of the same condicion."

" And *nede is* to have *be* al that was, and *nedeful is* to be al that is."—*Test of Love*.

" My head is twice as big as yours
It therefore *needs* must fit."—*John Gilpin*.

Need is therefore it must fit.

Let not this *needs* be confounded with the third person singular of the present tense of the verb *to need*, as,

" He *needs* assistance."

NIGH, NEAR.

Nigh and *near* are the Anglo Saxon adjective *nih* or *neah* and *next* or *nearest* is the superlative degree of it.

" When *bale* is greatest then is *bote* a *nye* bore."

When evil is greatest then is *aid* a *neighbour*.

Bote is our word *boot*, alluded to under the word *but*. *Nye bore* gives us the origin of our word *neighbour*, *bore* being our word *born*.

Nigh and *near* are still used as adjectives.

NOTWITHSTANDING.

To withstand is *to oppose*. *Not withstanding* means *not opposing*, a verbal adjective. (See the word *Not*.)

OF.

Of is supposed by Horne Tooke to be derived from the Anglo Saxon noun *afora*, meaning *consequence*, *offspring*, *successor*, *follower*, &c.

This meaning may be traced in the Russian termination *of* in proper names, as *Petersof* for what we should call *Peterson;* and in the Irish *O'Brien*, *O'Conner*, &c. which mean son of *Brien*, son of *Conner*, &c.

"Sickness of hunger or love."

That is, Hunger, *consequence*, sickness.
Love, *consequence*, sickness.

By inserting *for* instead of *of*, their difference and at the same time their capability of being used for each other will be explained.

Sickness *for* hunger.
Sickness *for* love.

That is, Sickness, *the cause*, hunger.
Sickness, *the cause*, love.

"I am sick *of* my husband and *for* my gallant," is another example of Horne Tooke, which he explains by inserting the words love and disgust in the following manner.

I am sick *of* (disgust) *for* my husband.
I am sick *for* (love) *of* my gallant.

We confess that this explanation and indeed all Mr. H. Tooke says on the subject of the word *of* is quite unsatisfacto-

ry. We know the danger of dissenting from such authority, and therefore would modestly express our doubts, and venture a conjecture, that *of* always means *having* or *adding*, and not the *consequence*. At any rate, this will *with less violence* explain the very instances he adduces to support his *conjecture*, for he is by no means *perfectly certain* in regard to his derivation.

Sickness *of* hunger.
Hunger's sickness.
Hunger *add* sickness.
Hunger having sickness.

We have already said that the apostrophe and *s* mean *add* or *join*, and it is well known that *of* will at any time supply their place.

I am sick *of* my husband, and *for* my gallant.
I am sick *having* my husband, and *the cause* my gallant.

Or, *Having* my husband, I am sick, and my gallant is *the cause*.

The death *of* my father was sudden.

If *of* mean *consequence*, is my father the consequence of death, or death the consequence of my father ?

The death *having* (or that has) my father was sudden.

The house of Lords or Commons adjourned.

Lords and Commons do not appear to be the *consequence* of the house, nor the house that of Lords and Commons.

The house *having* Lords or Commons adjourned.

Our limits will not enable us to go more fully into this discussion, and we leave it to the ingenuity of others.

OUGHT, (*See* Aught.)

OUT, (*See* In.)

ON, (*See* Upon.)

OFF.

Off is an adjective, but its origin and exact meaning are uncertain. It seems to be the

opposite of *on* and *to*, and to mean nearly the same as *from*. *Off* may be the Latin prefix *ab*, *from*, which is often written *af* by the common change of *b* into *f*, and *a* into *o*.

OPPOSITE.

Opposite is the Latin *oppositus*, *opposed*.

OFT, OFTEN.

Oft and *often* are always adjectives, and the latter admits of comparison by adding *er* and *est*.

OR, (*See* Either.)

OTHERWISE, (*See* Likewise.)

OVER.

Over is an adjective and means the same as *above*. (*See* Upon.)

"He gave me a dollar *over*."

That is, he gave me an *over* dollar, a superabundant or supernumerary dollar.

Moreover is the same as *over-plus*, *plus* being the Latin word for *more*.

"He stole and *more over* lied about it."

More and *over* qualify *he*.

ONCE, TWICE, THRICE.

These words were anciently written, *anes*, *anis*, *anys*, *ones*, *onys*; *twies*, *twyis*, *twyise*;

thries, *thriys*, &c. These are merely what most grammarians call the *possessive case* of one, two, three, and, to conform to the prevailing mode should be spelled *one's*, *two's*, *three's*, the word *time* or *turn* being understood.

"For *ones* that he hath ben blithe,
He shal ben after sorie *thries*."—*Gower*.

"So for defaut and grace of lawe
The people it stered all *at ones* (time.)"—*Gower*.

"Ye wote your self, she may not wedde two *at anes*."
Chaucer.

"Sythen Christ went neuer but *onys*
To weddyng."—*Wyfe of Bathe*.

"And all, for *anis* sake, droun in the seye."
Douglas.

"He sychit (sighed) profoundlye owthir *twyis* or *thryis*."
Douglas.

Owthir is our *other* or *either*, of which *or* is a contraction.

TRICE.

"In a trice." *Trice* is probably our word *thrice*, and means while one could count three. Gower spells it as he sometimes does *thrice*.

"All sodenly, as who saith *treis*,
He toke him from the mens sight."

PIECEMEAL.

This is a compound noun, *in* being understood before it.

We have seen no attempt to explain this word, and can therefore only conjecture that *meal* is a verbal adjective meaning

eating. A *meal* is an *eating*, *piecemeal* may mean in pieces suitable for eating, that is, *small pieces*.

Is it not possible that *meal* (flour) is corn broken small and made *edible*, and that *mill* is another spelling for *meal*, and *miller* is *mealer*. We say *rye*-meal and *oat*-meal, &c. and generally consider meal the noun, and *rye* and *oat* the adjectives, but the above hypothesis makes *rye* and *oat* the noun, and *meal* the adjective.

PISH, PSHAW.

Pish and *pshaw* are the Anglo Saxon *pæc*, *pæca*, and mean *trumpery*. *Trumpery* is the French word *tromperie*, and means *deception*.

PERCHANCE, PERADVENTURE.

Perchance is from the French *par-escheance*, which means *by chance*. *Per-adventure* is a similar compound, and means *by accident*.

PENDING.

Pending is a verbal adjective from the Latin *pendens*, *hanging*, that is, when not applied to substances, *in suspense*, *unfinished*, *undecided*.

"*Pending* the trial, he died."
The trial *unfinished*, he died.

PRITHEE.

Prithee is a contraction of *I pray thee*.

QUICKLY.

Quick*like*, *quick* is from the Anglo Saxon *cwic*, that is *living*, in which sense we still use

quick, as "The *quick* and the *dead*." *Quick-ly* means in a life-like or live-like manner. See our previous remarks on adjectives ending in *ly*.

QUITE.

Quite is the same as *quit*, and means *given up*, *free*, *clear*, *forsaken*, &c.

"He is *quite* sick," means
"He is *given up* to sickness, or completely sick."

"He is *quite* rich," means, He is *independently* rich, and of course *very* rich. This implied meaning of *completely*, *very*, &c. has almost superseded the original.

"But Persé, and I brook my lyffe,
Thy deth well *quyte* shall be."—*Chevy Chase.*

That is "But Percy, if I retain my life,
Thy death *quite well* shall be."

That is "*Paid well* shall be." The *and* in the first line is probably put for *an*, which see under the word *If*.

"It is not *quite* time," that is, *clear* time.

Clear means free from defects, that is, *perfect*.
The New-England farmers often use *clean* for *clear*, as, "it is *clean* gone, we *clean* beat them," &c. Perhaps *clear* and *clean* are varied spellings of the same word.

ROUND, AROUND.

Round means *circle*, and *around* means *on round*.

RATHER.

We once had in our language *rath* and *rathest*, as well as *rather*. These adjectives

answer to our early, earlier, earliest, as the following examples will show.

"The *rath* sower never borrows of the late."
Old Proverb.

"*Rath* ripe are some, and some of later kind."—*May.*

"Bring the *rathe* primrose that forsaken dies."—*Milton.*

"Why ryse you so *rathe?* Ey benedicite,
What eyleth you?"—*Chaucer.*

"Knowe iche (I) her aught, for my loue tel me this,
Than (then) wold I hope *rather* for to spede."—*Chaucer.*

"The *rather* spede, the soner may we go."—*Chaucer.*

"But fortune is of suche a sleyght,
That when a man is most on height,
She maketh hym *rathest* for to falle."—*Gower.*

"Who was ycrowned? by God* not the strongest, but he that *rathest* came and longest abode, &c.—*Testament of Love.*

SCARCE.

Scarce is an adjective, and *scarcely* is only *scarcelike*, which compound adjective has been explained. We give one instance of the ancient use of *scarce* more for the sake of showing the disregard of *persons* in the verb than to prove that *scarce* is an adjective, for it is often used as such at the present day.

"And *saith* the trouth, if thou hast bee
Unto thy loue or *scarce* or free."—*Gower.*

The following will assist us in ascertaining the meaning of the word.

"That men hold you not to *scarce* ne to *sparyng*."

---

* This exclamation is not uncommon in very ancient authors.

Scarce has not reference to *quantity* but to *occurrence.*

"I have *scarce* seen you."
I have rarely seen you.

"Money is *scarce.*"
Money is rarely seen.

SELDOM.

Seldom is an adjective, and its meaning and use similar to that of *scarce*, viz. rare, unfrequent.

"I me rejoyced of my lyberte
That *selden time* is found in mariage."—*Chaucer.*

"I seldom go." Seldom qualifies *I*, or the noun *I* refers to.

SOMETIMES.

Some-times. These words should never be joined.

"Men at *some times* are masters of their fates.
Shakspeare.

Some is an adjective, meaning *a portion, a few*, and is nearly the opposite of *much* and *many.* It may be parsed as a *noun*, as *much* and *many* may be. The pupil must carefully notice, however, that this adjective *some* is the reverse of the affix *some* in such words as trouble*some*, game*some*, &c. for which see *some*, under the head of *affixes.*

STARK.

Stark is an adjective from the Ang. Saxon *starc*, and means *strong.*

"The *followand* wynd blew *stark* in our tail."
Douglas.

We have already hinted that the *ing* of our verbal adjectives was once written *and*, and like *ed*, *eth*, &c. only meant *join* or *add*.

"This egle—
Me caryeng in hys clawes *starke*
As lyghtly as I had been a larke."—*Chaucer.*

"Turnus, ane litil, thocht he was stark and stout,
Begouth *frawart* the bargane to withdraw."—*Douglas.*

Frawart is *from-ward* the opposite of *to-ward*. *From-ward* is still extant in the word *froward*, which means *turned from* or *perverse*, *perverse* meaning *turned from* in Latin.

"With ane loupe knot, ane *stark* corde or lace."
Douglas.

1*st Boor.* "Come, English beer, boy, English beer!
2*d Boor.* *Stark* beer, boy, stout and strong beer."
Beaumont and Fletcher.

"He is *stark* mad." He is *strong* mad.

"He is *stark* naked," means, he is *naked* in a *strong degree*, that is, entirely so.

STILL, (*See* Yet.)

SO, (*See* As.)

SINCE.

Since is a verbal adjective of the Ang. Sax. verb *seon*, *to see*, and may generally be rendered by *seen* or *seeing*.

Since has passed through various forms of orthography, most of which are now disused. Some of the latter modes of spelling it are, *syne*, *sine*, *sene*, *sen*, *syn*, *sin*, *seand*, *sens*, *sense*, *sence*, *sithe*, *sith*, *sithence*, (that is *seen thence*.) *Syne* is still familiar to us in the popular song of "Auld lang *syne*."

"It is a year *since*." It is a year *seen*.

"Did George Fourth begin to reign *since* his father's insanity?"
His father's insanity *seen*, did George IV begin to reign?

"If I should labour for any other satisfaction but that of my own mind, it would be folly, *since*, (seeing) it is not truth, but opinion that can travel the world without a passport."

"*Since* death takes all!" *Seeing* death takes all.
Since may also be put for *seeing*.

"It seems to me most strange that men should fear,
Seeing that death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come."—*Shakspeare*.

SAVE, (*See* Except.)

THAT.

We have already called *that* an adjective, and asserted that it never is any thing else; *but*, as this word is called also a *conjunction* and a *relative* pronoun by Mr. Murray and others, we shall illustrate our position by a few examples.

We use *that* after *if, an, unless, though, but, without, lest, since, save, except*, and other words which Murray calls conjunctions. We have shown these misnamed conjunctions to be verbs, we now add that *that*, after them, is an adjective pointing out the thing to be *given, dismissed, excepted*, &c.

Examples of *That* when used as a *conjunction*, according to Mr. Murray:—

I wish you to believe *that* I would not wilfully hurt a fly.
I would not willingly hurt a fly, I wish you to believe *that* (assertion.)

She knowing that Crooke had been indicted, did so and so.
Crooke had been indicted for forgery, she knowing *that* (fact) did so and so.

Thieves rise by night *that* they may plunder.
Thieves may plunder, (for) *that* (purpose) they rise by night.

"Take care *that* every day be well *employed.*"
Be every day well employed, take *that* care.

"I hope he will believe *that* I have not acted improperly."
I have not acted improperly, I hope he will believe *that* (assertion.)

Examples wherein *that* is used as a *Relative Pronoun* according to Mr. Murray:—

"He has a heart *that* bleeds for others."
He has a heart—that (heart) bleeds for others.

"They *that* reprove us may be our best friends."

That, Mr. Murray says, stands for *who*, and *who* has an antecedent which is *they*; *they*, he says, stands *instead* of the noun *persons*. *They* and *that* are words, therefore, whose business it is to point out the noun, *persons*. It has already been hinted that *the*, *this*, *these*, *that*, *it*, *those*, and *they* are different spellings of the same word, and have the same meaning and use. In the famous ballad of *Chevy Chase*, *the* is in every instance used for *they*.

"With fifteen hondrith archares bold,
The wear chosen out of shyars thre."

"*The* began in Chyviat *the* hyls above."

"*The* wear twenty hondrith spearmen good,
Withouten any fayle;
The wear borne along *be* (by) the water *a* (of) Twyde,
Yth (in the) bowndes of Tividale."

Thee is, in the same ballad, uniformly spelled with one *e*.

"In *the* spyte of thyne and of *the*."

We are accustomed to consider *that* as singular, but, in one instance above cited, it is plural, as it often is, and used to be.

"I think that that that that man says is true."
I think that (thought) that (thing) that man says, that (thing) is true.

But we have a right to use the other modes of spelling, and we can do this without changing the sense.

I think *this* thought; *the* (thing) *that* man says, that (thing) is true.

"O that mine enemy would write a book."

Mine enemy would write a book, O, (I wish) that (circumstance.)

THAN.

Than, we have no doubt, means *that*, and perhaps *that one* or *the one*, but it is difficult sometimes to introduce these substitutes satisfactorily. (See Ex. at the word *Unless*.)

"Charity is greater *than* Faith."
Charity is greater *that* Faith is.
Charity is greater *that (great)* Faith (is.)
Faith is that (great,) charity is greater.

Than is never used except after the *second* degree of comparison, and for a general rule we think the *first* degree of the adjective put after *that* will remove every difficulty. Thus,

"Wealth is better *than* poverty."
Poverty is *that* (good,) wealth is better.

THUS.

Thus is probably *this*, (way, manner, or some such word being understood.)

"*Thus* we are born, *thus* live, and *thus* we die."

So, in these cases, may be changed for *thus*, and *so* means *that*. (See the word *so*.)

TO, TILL, AT.

To is the Gothic noun *taui*, and means *end*, *result*, *completion*. *To* is probably from the same root as our verb DO, *d* and *t* being often used for each other in the changes which language undergoes. *To do*, in Latin,

is *agere*, its participle *actum*, *done*, and hence our word *act*, *a thing finished or ended*. *Act* is contracted into *at*. Hence the reason why *at* and *to* have a meaning so very similar. *Till* is a word compounded of *to* and *while*, and *while* means *time*, hence, after *from*, *till* is only used when we speak of time, whilst *to* is used whether time or place be spoken of.

Thus, taking the examples under the word *From*, we say,

"Figs come *from* Turkey *to* Boston."
Figs come *beginning* Turkey, *end* Boston.

"Stars fall *from* heaven *to* earth."
Stars fall *beginning* heaven, *end* earth.

"Icicles hang *from* trees *to* ground."
Icicles hang *beginning* trees, *end* ground.

We do not say *from* Turkey *till* Boston.

"*From* morn *till* night the eternal larum rung."
Beginning morn *to time* night the eternal larum rang.

We have no similar compound word which expresses *to place* but we can say,

"*From* Turkey *to* (place) Boston." (See the word *From*.)

So much for Mr. H. Tooke's derivation. We are inclined, however, to think that *to* and *at* are the same word, *at* being derived from the Latin *ad*, and *to* being a corruption of *at*. We have noticed a very strong propensity to use them indifferently for each other; and in most cases, in rapid conversation, it is difficult to tell by the ear which is used; thus, He is 't'home, he is 't'work, &c.

TILL, (*See* To.)

TOWARD, (*See* Ward.)

TODAY, TOMORROW.

To-day and *to-morrow* mean *the* or *this day* or *morrow*. In some dialects it is com-

mon to hear the expression, "I will come *the* day or *the* morrow.

Morrow means *morning* only, and not the whole of the day. Thus in an old translation of the New Testament, we find,

"He expownede, witnessynge the kyngdom of God fro the *morewe* till to eventide."—*Dedis. chap.* xxviii. *v.* 23.

On is usually understood before *today* and *tomorrow*.

TOGETHER.

Together we have never seen etymologically explained. We suppose, however, that it means *the-gather*, *gather* meaning *collection* or *heap*. The Scotch still write the word *thegither*, *by* or *in* being understood before it.

"They all perished *together*."

They all perished *in the gather*, that is, *in a heap*.

TOO.

We can get no light upon the subject of this word, but are inclined to think it is our numeral *two*.

"He is good and wise too."
He is *two* (things) good and wise.
He is *both* good and wise.

"He too is good and wise."

This sentence implies that some other has been called good and wise, then, "He *two* is good and wise."

"He is *too* poor to be taxed." That is
He is *two* (things) poor and to be taxed, or
He is *two* poor to be taxed; that is,
He is to be taxed (he is) poor *two*.

This sentence seems at variance with our conjecture, but *two* may be used to express *excess* without doing violence to analogy, as we not unfrequently say, "It is *doubly* dear," which certainly means it is *two* dear, or *twice* dear. *Two* and *too* are each spelled the two ways in ancient authors.

TWICE, THRICE, TRICE. (*See* Once.)

THROUGH.

Through, anciently spelled *thourough*, *thorow*, *thorough*, *thro*, &c. is the Ang. Sax. noun *thuruh* and means *door*, *gate* or *passage*.

"Than cometh ydlenesse, that is the yate of all harmes. This ydlenes is the *thorruke* of all wycked and vylane thoughts."
Chaucer.

——So conioyned be,
Ulstris armes and Glocestris *thurgh* and *thurgh*,
As shewith our wyndowes in houses thre.
Warton's Hist of Eng. Poetry. 1356.

THOUGH.

Though, or as it has been spelled, *tho*, *thah*, *thaf*, *thauf*, and *thof*, is the Ang. Saxon verb, *thafian*, and means *to allow*, *permit*, *grant*, *yield*, or *assent*. Hence *albeit* and *although* are used for each other, *be it all* and *grant* or *allow all* being equivalent expressions.

Though and *if* may be used for each other also, for they each mean *give* or *grant*. Thus,

"*Though* an host of men rise up against me, yet shall not my heart be afraid," or "*If* an host of men, &c."

"*Though* all men forsake you, yet will not I," or "*If* all men forsake you, &c."

In either case the meaning is "*grant* or *allow* that all men forsake you, &c."

UNLESS.

Unless, or as it used to be spelled, *onles*, is the Ang. Saxon verb *dismiss* or *except*, and either of these verbs may be put instead of it. *Les* was sometimes used for *unless*.

"*Gif* he commyttis any tressoun, suld he not de;
Les than (*that*) his prince, of great humanite,
Perdoun his fault for his long trew service?"
Douglas. Prologue to Ænead. B. x.

It is this same verb *les*, which is placed at the end of nouns, and, uniting with them, has produced such adjectives as *hopeless*, *restless*, *deathless*, *motionless*, &c. that is, *dismiss* hope, rest, death, motion, &c. *Less* in these words is equivalent to *without*, which will be presently explained.

UPON, UP, ON, OVER, BOVE, ABOVE.

These words, says Horne Tooke, have all one common origin and signification, *ufon*, *ufan*, *ufa*, meaning *high*.

Ufa in Anglo Saxon is thus compared, *ufa*, *ufera*, *ufemœst*; in English, *up* or *upon*, *upper* or *over*, *upmost* or *uppermost*, and, formerly, *upperest* and *overest*.

Bove is from *be-ufa*, or *bufa*, and *above* is from *on-bufa*.

All these words are used as adjectives in English.

"He is *up* or *upon* a tree.

Up qualifies *he*.

"The water rose *over* us," that is,
The water rose *higher* us (rose or were.)

After the second degree of comparison, we generally insert *than*, and then we use *we* instead of *us*.

"The water rose higher than we (*rose* or *were*.")

Whatever *than* may be, it cannot alter the structure or the office of the pronoun.

Ufa is supposed to have its origin from some word meaning *top* or *head*.

There appears to be some doubt about the origin of *on*, but if the *uf* of *ufon* is the source of *up*, why may not the *on* be the source of our word *on*, for *up* and *on* sometimes have the same meaning? *On* may possibly be our numeral *one*, and may mean *join*, an idea easily flowing from *unity*.

UNDER, (*See the word* Beneath.)

VERY.

Very means *true*, and is a corrupt pronunciation of the French adjective *vrai*. When it was originally borrowed from the Latin, both English and French spelled it *veray*.

"O thou, my child, do lerne, I the pray,
Vertew and *veray* labour to assay."—*Douglas*.

"And it is clere and open that thilke sentence of Plato is *very* and sothe."—*Chaucer*.

"He is a *very* tiger in his disposition."

"It is *very* blue." It is *true* blue.

"He is *very* sick." He is *true* sick, that is, "He is sick *without deception*."

WHO, WHICH, WHAT, WHY, WHEN, WHERE, HOW, WHITHER, WHETHER, &c.

These words are probably only varied spellings of the same word. They appear to be derived from the Latin adjective *quis*, *quæ*, *quod*, *&c.* Several circumstances favour this supposition. They were at first spelled *quho*, *quhat*, *quhy*, *quhen* and *quhan*, *quhar*. In the Latin language it is customary to use this adjective as we do without plac-

ing after it the noun expressing person, thing, cause, time, place, manner. *There*, in times not very remote was spelled *ther*, *thir*, *thair*, *their*, *thare*. At the time this word was spelled *ther* and *thir*; *this*, *that*, and *these* were spelled in the same manner. At that period, *therefore* was very properly spelled *therefor*, *for* meaning *cause*, whereas the modern *fore* means *in advance* or *ahead*, and makes nonsense. *There* in the word *therefore*, and *where* in the word *wherefore*, never have any reference to *place*.

We will endeavour to exhibit the meaning and derivation of these and several kindred words in the following

TABLE.

who, whose, whom, which, what	mean	*what* (*person* or *thing* understood.)
why	,,	what (cause or reason)
when	,,	what (time)
where	,,	what (place)
how	,,	what (way or manner)
whether	,,	the what (way)
whither	,,	the what (place)
then	,,	that (time)

thence	means	that	}
there	,,	that	
thither	,,	the that	} place
here	,,	this	
hither	,,	the this	
hence	,,	this	}

We suppose the following to be the derivation and composition of the above words.

who, whose,	from	quo, quo's	}
whom	,,	quem	} Latin for *what*
which	,,	quis	
what	,,	quod	}
why	,,	quo, (in French, *quoi*)	
when	,,	quam *or* quen, Latin for *what*	
where	,,	quo, the same as above	
how	,,	quo, (h*ow* is *w*ho)	
whether	,,	quo *and* ther	

These are what grammarians call *Interrogatives*, because they are used in asking questions. We derive the others as follows.

Then, from *the-en* (*en* being a common termination, and meaning *add.*) *Thine* is probably the same word *the-en*.

Thence, from *the-en's*, it being no uncommon thing to put on *two* terminations in this way, for instance, the plural of *child* was

SOME, is the termination of the highest degree of comparison of Latin adjectives, *ssimus*, that is, *summus*, meaning *highest, most, &c.* as light*some*, giving much light; trouble*some*, giving much trouble; game*some*, much disposed to game; burden*some*, *very* heavy, &c. *Some* is called an *augmentive* affix.

FUL, is the adjective *full.*

OUS, is an *augmentive* affix, probably from the Latin *os*, as calamit*ous*, abounding in calamity; disastr*ous*, abounding in disaster.

ABLE, } are the Latin adjective *habile*, the *h*
IBLE, } being dropped as it is in Latin when an affix. It is generally affixed to verbs, and implies ability or power to receive or do the action expressed by the verb, as teach*able*, move*able*, capable of being moved or taught; and forc*ible*, convers*able*, able to force or converse. *Able* is, in fact, our adjective *able*.

LY, a contraction of *Like*, has been already noticed under the class of adjectives. It is immediately from *gleick* or *gelyk*, and more remotely perhaps from *eikelos*, the Greek for *equal*.

WARD, } These words have been previously
WISE, } explained. *Ward* means, *in the* direction of; and *wise* means *ways*, or perhaps *way's*.

AFFIXES OF VERBS.

ED, EST, ETH, ES, S, we have already noticed these terminations when treating of the person and tense of verbs, and therefore shall only say here that they merely fit the verb to be joined to some other word, and have no reference whatever to *time*, *number* or *person*. If *ed* denote past time, it is a fair question where we must look for the expression of past time in such verbs as have no *ed* in the past tense.

ING, was once written *ante*, *ant*, *and*, &c. and is evidently the Latin participle affix *ans* and *ens*. The nasal sound in *ing* was brought into our language when the French under William the Conqueror took possession of the British throne. This termination is the same as the adjective affix *on*, *en*, &c. already explained.

EN, is the Anglo Saxon termination of what some call the *infinitive mood*, the same

as our *verbal name.* It was often used by the early English writers, and has survived to our day in such words as slack*en*, black*en*, lik*en*, fright*en*, &c.

IZE, is a Greek termination of verbs.

ER, in such verbs as batt*er*, sputt*er*, &c. seems to be the Latin termination *are*, *ere*, thus batter is *battere*, to beat, and sputter is *sputare*, to spit.

ISH, in such words as flourish, banish, garnish (which is corrupted into furnish,) is derived from the first person of the present, indicative, of French verbs. Thus flourish is from *fleuris ;* banish from *bannis ;* garnish from *garnis*, &c. The *s* was not silent formerly in French.

FY, this very common affix is the Latin verb *fio*, to make. Thus beauti*fy* is to make beautiful ; clari*fy*, to make *clarus*, the Latin for clear ; recti*fy*, to make *rectum*, the Latin for right ; satis*fy*, to make satisfied, *satis* is the Latin for *enough.*

THE ALPHABET

CONSIDERED ETYMOLOGICALLY.

The Goths and other nations of Europe who were conquered by the Romans, probably had no alphabets of their own, but adopted that of their conquerors, the Latin. The consequence was, that, in English there are some useless letters; some sounds which have no letter to represent them; and some letters which represent several sounds. Hence arises our irregular orthography, and the difficulty of tracing kindred words to their common origin. To enable the pupil to account in some measure for the changes which have taken place in English words, or in words adopted from other languages, the Alphabet may be arranged thus;

1. A, E, I, O, U, W, Y.
2. B, P, M, F, V, Ph.
3. C, G, K, Qu, X, H, Ch, Gh.
4. D, T, Z, S, N, J.
5. L, R.

Each of these classes may be etymologically considered as *one* letter.

The *first* class are called *vowels*,* because they represent simple or distinct sounds.

The four other classes are called *consonants*,† because in sounding them we also use the sound of a vowel.

The *second* class are called *Labials*‡ because they are pronounced by a compression of the *lips*.

The *third* class are called *Gutturals*,§ because they are pronounced by a compression or action of the *throat*.

The *fourth* class are called *Dentals*,‖ because they require the compression or action of the *teeth*.

The *fifth* class, L, and R, are called *Linguals*,¶ because they require the action of the *tongue* upon the roof of the mouth.

Letters of one class most frequently interchange with those of the same class, but they also interchange occasionally with words of the other classes.

---

* From the Latin word *Vocalis*, which comes from *Vox*, a voice or sound.

† From the Latin words *Con* and *Sonans* which mean *sounding with*.

‡ From the Latin *Labialis*, which is an adjective from *Labium, a Lip*.

§ From *Gutturalis*, which is the adjective of *Guttur*, the Latin for *Throat*.

‖ From *Dentalis*, the adjective derived from *Dens*, Latin for *Tooth*.

¶ From *Lingua*, the Latin for *Tongue*.

In fact, H does not deserve to be called a letter, U, V, and W, are essentially the same letter; so are I, J, and Y. X is as much a double or compound letter as Ch and Gh. Q is never used without *u*, and Qu are only ku. C and K are the same letter, and C should be discarded. Even G and C are nearly identical.

A few instances of this change of letters or suppression of them will be given to set the pupil upon the hunt for similar instances.

vacillo,	*Lat.*	waggle.	papa,	*Ital.*	pope.
vastus,	„	waste.	waned,		want.
virtus,	„	worth.	learned,		learnt, and words of similar termination.
habile,	„	able.			
aula,	„	hall.			
fœmina,	„	woman.	diurnal,		journal.
wind,		bend.	flamma,	*Lat.*	flame.
war,		mars.	mourn,		moan.
dale,		dell.	high,		height, haughty.
haste,		fast.			
hunt,		hound.	baneful,		baleful.
sergeant,		servant.	cant,		chaunt.
earth,		hearth.	close,		clause.
intimate, (contracted into)		hint.	fait,		fit, feat.
			track,		tract. trait. trace.
corn, (on the toe, cornus, *Lat.*)		horn.			
domus,	*Lat.*	home.	suit,		suite.
truth,		troth.	ballad,		ballet.
pater,	*Lat.*	father.	vow,		vote.
mater,	„	mother.	taint,		tint.

private,	privy.
pact,	peace,
chewed,	cud.
cowered,	coward.
cleft,	clift, cliff.
baken,	bacon.
wrung,	wrong.
bit,	bite, bait.
bond,	band, bound, bund-le.
strong,	strung.
chop,	chip.
plight,	plot, pledge.
spit,	spout.
sop,	soup, sup, sip.
knot,	net.
slop,	slip, slope.
sheer,	shred, short, shirt.
car,	cart, chariot.
ope,	gap, chap, chaps.
peck,	pock, pox, pick.
pit,	pot.
sorrow,	sorry, sore.
pond,	pound, pen.
bow,	bough.
stake,	stock, stick, stitch.
dry,	drain, drone.
shell,	scale, scull.
break,	breach, broach, wreck, wretch, rack.
wreath,	wrath, wroth, writhe.
owl,	howl, yell.
room,	rim, brim.
click,	clack, clock.
rack,	rake, rich, riches.
snake,	sneak.
din,	dint, dun.
dike,	ditch.
thick,	thigh.
witch,	wicked.
need,	needle.
deep,	dip.
wile,	guile, guilt, gull.
milk,	milch.
chill,	cool, cooled, cold.
clutch,	latch, lace.
wake,	watch.
grave,	groove, grove.
cage,	keg.
shade,	shed.

APPENDIX.

STRICTURES ON MURRAY'S GRAMMAR,

FIRST PRINTED IN THE

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION.

It must be apparent to every observer, that, while not only the mode of teaching other branches of knowledge, but also the text books used, have become more rational, practical, and simple, still the subject of *grammar* remains almost untouched. It is true, that since the days of Lowth, who was the pattern of Murray, various authors have written and published *improved* grammars, but these have been mere commentaries upon their predecessors. The followers of Murray in this country, (and we have the books of thirty before us,) have been careful to preserve nearly all his peculiarities, contenting themselves with making a different arrangement of them, and attempting a clearer illustration of his errours. The subject of English Grammar is as much in the dark as ever; and the innumerable commentaries upon Murray have answered no valuable purpose, except to convince the unbiassed that there is a want of simplicity in the text, or the comments and illustrations would be unnecessary.

In the United States, Murray's Grammar, under one form or another, is universally used; and so satisfied is the publick mind of its perfection, that any attempt to check its progress will be viewed as a desperate adventure. It may be so, but more desperate adventures have succeeded, and no effort, however humble, to check the progress of errour, can be entirely without effect. It was the few seeds of truth, scattered just before the reformation of Luther, which finally took root and overspread Christendom.

Let it not be supposed that a more rational system of grammar, than that which prevails, has never been attempted, or that we claim any merit on the score of discovery. Numerous distinguished philologers, at the head of whom is Horne Tooke, have in their elaborate works proved that the preva-

lent system of English Grammar has no adaptation to that language. These works, however, are but little known in this country, and, so far as they affect the mode of teaching, are a dead letter. We shall freely draw upon them for ideas and arguments, acknowledging once for all our obligations to them, and expressing our astonishment that when such truly great minds have protested against the foreign rack on which our simple language has been stretched, no effort has been made by its friends, who must have been acquainted with the fact, to rescue it from its uneasy situation.

Dr. Lowth, in the preface to his grammar, says, "The English language is perhaps of all the present European languages by much the most simple in its form and construction;" again, "a grammatical study of our own language makes no part of the ordinary method of instruction, which we pass through in our childhood;" and again, after mentioning the insufficiency of various helps to enable us to form a good English style, he observes: "much less then will what is commonly called *learning* serve the purpose; that is, a critical knowledge of ancient languages and much reading of ancient authors. The greatest critic and most able grammarian of the last age, when he came to apply his learning and criticism to an English author, was frequently at a loss in matters of ordinary use, and common construction in his own *vernacular idiom*." Finally, after stating that the first design of grammar is "to teach us to express ourselves with propriety," he adds, "but there is a secondary use to which it may be applied, and which I think, is not attended to as it deserves, viz. the facilitating of the acquisition of other languages, whether ancient or modern." Then, after asserting that the study of English Grammar is a great preparation for the study of the Latin Grammar, he makes the important confession, "a design, somewhat of this kind, gave occasion to the following little system intended merely for private and domestic use."

We make these extracts because the English Grammar of the distinguished Latin scholar, who wrote them, was the basis of Murray's system, for the latter only refined a little upon the other's speculations. We gather therefore from the extracts, that English Grammar then formed no part of an English education; that Lowth's grammar was not intended for a school book, but for private use; that a *learned* man, that is a Latin and a Greek scholar, was not the proper person to make an English Grammar; that, of course, Dr. Lowth was disqualified; and lastly, that, as one very important design in making the English Grammar was to introduce the pupil to Latin Grammar, it is but fair to presume that the English Gram-

APPENDIX.

STRICTURES ON MURRAY'S GRAMMAR,

FIRST PRINTED IN THE

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION.

It must be apparent to every observer, that, while not only the mode of teaching other branches of knowledge, but also the text books used, have become more rational, practical, and simple, still the subject of *grammar* remains almost untouched. It is true, that since the days of Lowth, who was the pattern of Murray, various authors have written and published *improved* grammars, but these have been mere commentaries upon their predecessors. The followers of Murray in this country, (and we have the books of thirty before us,) have been careful to preserve nearly all his peculiarities, contenting themselves with making a different arrangement of them, and attempting a clearer illustration of his errours. The subject of English Grammar is as much in the dark as ever; and the innumerable commentaries upon Murray have answered no valuable purpose, except to convince the unbiassed that there is a want of simplicity in the text, or the comments and illustrations would be unnecessary.

In the United States, Murray's Grammar, under one form or another, is universally used; and so satisfied is the publick mind of its perfection, that any attempt to check its progress will be viewed as a desperate adventure. It may be so, but more desperate adventures have succeeded, and no effort, however humble, to check the progress of errour, can be entirely without effect. It was the few seeds of truth, scattered just before the reformation of Luther, which finally took root and overspread Christendom.

Let it not be supposed that a more rational system of grammar, than that which prevails, has never been attempted, or that we claim any merit on the score of discovery. Numerous distinguished philologers, at the head of whom is Horne Tooke, have in their elaborate works proved that the preva-

lent system of English Grammar has no adaptation to that language. These works, however, are but little known in this country, and, so far as they affect the mode of teaching, are a dead letter. We shall freely draw upon them for ideas and arguments, acknowledging once for all our obligations to them, and expressing our astonishment that when such truly great minds have protested against the foreign rack on which our simple language has been stretched, no effort has been made by its friends, who must have been acquainted with the fact, to rescue it from its uneasy situation.

Dr. Lowth, in the preface to his grammar, says, "The English language is perhaps of all the present European languages by much the most simple in its form and construction;" again, "a grammatical study of our own language makes no part of the ordinary method of instruction, which we pass through in our childhood;" and again, after mentioning the insufficiency of various helps to enable us to form a good English style, he observes: "much less then will what is commonly called *learning* serve the purpose; that is, a critical knowledge of ancient languages and much reading of ancient authors. The greatest critic and most able grammarian of the last age, when he came to apply his learning and criticism to an English author, was frequently at a loss in matters of ordinary use, and common construction in his own *vernacular idiom.*" Finally, after stating that the first design of grammar is "to teach us to express ourselves with propriety," he adds, "but there is a secondary use to which it may be applied, and which I think, is not attended to as it deserves, viz. the facilitating of the acquisition of other languages, whether ancient or modern." Then, after asserting that the study of English Grammar is a great preparation for the study of the Latin Grammar, he makes the important confession, "a design, somewhat of this kind, gave occasion to the following little system intended merely for private and domestic use."

We make these extracts because the English Grammar of the distinguished Latin scholar, who wrote them, was the basis of Murray's system, for the latter only refined a little upon the other's speculations. We gather therefore from the extracts, that English Grammar then formed no part of an English education; that Lowth's grammar was not intended for a school book, but for private use; that a *learned* man, that is a Latin and a Greek scholar, was not the proper person to make an English Grammar; that, of course, Dr. Lowth was disqualified; and lastly, that, as one very important design in making the English Grammar was to introduce the pupil to Latin Grammar, it is but fair to presume that the English Gram-

mar was made as much like the Latin as it was possible to make it.

The object we have in view, in these strictures, is merely to point out the more glaring inconsistencies of Murray's grammar. We are therefore obliged to confine our remarks to the leading points in his second division of grammar, Etymology.

Murray says, "there are in English nine sorts of words, or, as they are commonly called, *parts of speech*." We shall not dispute about terms; although it would be a fair question to ask, if there are not as many parts of speech as there are words used in speaking; or, indeed, if a letter is not a part of speech, so that, properly speaking, we have twenty-six parts of speech. We do not wish to cavil unnecessarily, nor shall we, with Horne Tooke and others, resolve all the *classes* of words, into one. We are willing to allow three, and shall, in our remarks upon them, endeavour to follow the order our author has adopted.

THE ARTICLE.

'An article is a word prefixed to substantives to point them out, and to show how far their signification extends.' Again, *'there are but two articles, A and THE. A becomes AN before a vowel or a silent h.'*

It was not difficult to find words in English resembling the nouns, verbs, adjectives, &c. of the ancient languages; but this was not enough for the first English Grammarians, they must find in English as many *sorts of words* as were said to exist elsewhere. Something called an article was found in Greek, and suspected to exist in Latin. *O*, the Greek article, is equivalent to *hic* in Latin, and *hic* in Latin, is *this*, (in some dialects *thic*,) in English. But Murray calls *this* a pronoun. *The*, his article, is a contraction of *this*, once spelled *thae* and afterwards *the*. *The* has been pressed into the service and made an article; while *this* has been denied *the* (or *this* or *that*) *honour*; for two words that are entitled to form a separate class are certainly highly distinguished.

Now we venture to say that in every important case *this*, *that*, *these* and *those* may be substituted for *the* without altering the sense. Mr. Murray says that *the* in the sentence 'Nathan said unto David, thou art *the* man,' is peculiarly emphatical. But thou art *this* or *that* man is equally so.

An article, (our author says,) is a word prefixed to substantives. *This* and *that*, *these* and *those*, *one*, *two*, *three*, and every

other numeral and ordinal adjective, are prefixed to nouns, in the same way, '*to point them out*,' and even '*to show how far their signification extends*,' for they effectually limit the signification of the noun. *The* man, *this* man, *that* man, *forty* men, *seventh* man. The words in Italics are all articles, if Murray's definition be correct. Thus we have disposed of one article. Not satisfied with *one* (that is *an*) article, our grammarians must have *two*. *An* is a contraction of *one*. *An* is generally contracted into *a* before words beginning with a consonant, and *a* does not become *an*, as Mr. Murray asserts; for, at no very remote period of our literature, *an* was used before all words. One is sometimes spelled *ane*, hence *an*. *A* book is *one* book. The article *un* which the French grammarians have impressed into the class of articles, is also their numeral adjective. How a numeral adjective can be called *indefinite* is hard to conceive. Is one or ten an indefinite number?

The fact is *a*, *an*, and *the*, are as good adjectives as any in our language; and had there not been an article in the Greek Grammar, these words would have been left among the adjectives in ours.

THE SUBSTANTIVE.

'*A substantive or noun is the name of any thing that exists, or of which we have any notion.*'

Why the term *substantive* should be preferred to *noun*, or, what is better, *name*, we know not. Substantive carries with it the *notion* of substance; but many nouns are unsubstantial. *Noun* or *name* has no such objection. We think the definition would be less mystical if it merely said, 'a noun is the name of any thing,' or, to save tautology, 'the first class of words are names.' It is as well to say nothing about *existence*, for some nouns imply *non*existence.

Then comes the following distinction.

'*Substantives are either proper or common.*'

'*Proper* nouns are names appropriated to individuals.' All nouns in the singular must be individual names, hence our author adds, '*common* nouns may also be made to signify individuals by the addition of articles or pronouns!' That is, proper nouns are common nouns and common nouns are proper nouns. But this is not the best of it. He says, 'Common nouns stand for kinds, containing many sorts, or for sorts containing many individuals,' and then very truly adds, 'when *proper* names have an article (that is *an adjective*) annexed to them,

they are used as *common* names.' We venture to assert that there is no distinction of proper and common nouns, and we bring the above extracts to prove our assertion. We say that every noun in the singular is the name of an individual, and George is no more appropriated to an (that is *one*) individual, than any other singular noun; for there are or may be a thousand Georges. It is true that 'when proper nouns have an article before them they are used as common names,' but it is also true that they are used as common names, *without* what Mr. Murray calls the article. The Cæsars were emperors; Twelve Cæsars were emperors. It is also true that *proper* names become *common* without either an article or an adjective before them. 'Cæsars were once emperors, now they are dogs.' Why then this unmeaning distinction, contradicted in the very page that asserts it?

'*All nouns are of the third person when spoken of, and of the second when spoken to.*' There is no need of this distinction on Mr. Murray's plan, for he does not let any noun of the second person change its own termination or that of its verb. Grant, however, that nouns have persons, why have they only *two?* Do not some nouns represent the person *speaking*, as well as the person *spoken to?* 'I, Mr. Murray puzzle children,' is as good an instance of the first person, as 'Be grateful children of men,' is of the second.

Even Mr. Murray seems to have some rational views, for in his remarks upon passive verbs he has these remarkable words. 'The English tongue is in many respects materially different from the learned languages. It is, therefore, very possible to be mistaken ourselves, and to mislead and perplex others, by an undistinguishing attachment to the principles, and arrangement of Greek and Latin grammarians. Much of the confusion and perplexity, with which we meet in the writings of some English Grammarians, on the subject of verbs, moods and conjugations, (he might have said *cases* also,) has arisen from misapplication of names. We are apt to think that the old names must always be attached to the identical forms and things to which they were anciently attached. But if we rectify this mistake, and properly adjust the names to the peculiar forms and nature of the things in our own language, we shall be clear and consistent in our ideas;' (and, we add, *not till then.*) It is to be lamented that in the very chapter which contains the above remarks, Mr. Murray undertakes to defend his system of moods, tenses, voices, &c. on the score of 'their utility, convenience, resemblance to the Latin, beautiful symmetry,' &c. for, he concludes, 'although the learned lan-

guages, with respect to the voices, moods and tenses, are, *in general*, differently constructed from the English tongue, *Yet in some respects*, they are so similar to it, as to warrant the principle which I,' (Mr. Murray,) 'have adopted.'

We are willing to admit that there is a convenience in allowing to nouns two situations in the sentence, which situations, Mr. Murray, who seems to be one of those whom he describes as 'apt to think that old names must continue to be attached to what they were anciently attached to,' calls cases, at erm possibly applicable to Latin, but not at all to English nouns. Let us examine his definitions.

The Nominative Case simply expresses the name of a thing, or the subject of the verb. As 'The girls learn.' If this definition has any meaning separate from the definition of nouns in general, we cannot discover it. The objective case also, 'simply expresses the name of a thing', and is the subject on which the verb acts. 'The girls learn' (what subject?) 'grammar.' The 'surgeons dissect' (what subjects?) 'bodies.' Are the girls and surgeons the *subjects* of the verbs *learn* and *dissect?* The fact is, the nominative and objective cases, as he calls them, are the same word, the same 'name of a thing;' sometimes acting, when they are placed before the verb; and sometimes the subject or object of action, when, in the sense, they follow the verb.

The term *nominative* from the Latin *nomino* to name, has led Mr. Murray to give a definition which implies that the objective case is not the name of a thing. Had he said a word of the doubts which have been raised in regard to the possessive case being the name of a thing, we should have been less inclined to censure him. There has been a spirited contest on this subject, some grammarians asserting that all adjectives are nouns, and others that all nouns are adjectives. It may be well to remark that, whichever existed first, the noun or adjective, it is clear that what we now call nouns may be used as adjectives and verbs also, as 'eye,' 'to eye,' 'eye ball;' and if some words sound oddly when used in either of these three ways, it is not because the genius of our language forbids such use of them, but because such use is uncommon or unnecessary.

The terminations of the numerous cases in Latin and Greek, and of the possessive in English were undoubtedly significant of something. It is generally supposed that the *is*, or *es* of our possessive was equivalent to *add* or *join*, and therefore 'my father's house' is the same as 'my father add house.' The omission of the *e* or *i* before *s*, and the substitution of the

apostrophe, are the work of more modern times, and were no doubt intended to distinguish the possessive from the plural of nouns, which were before spelled alike. But this termination was by no means indispensable, nor was it generally affixed to nouns. There can be no doubt that in such expressions as 'bell rope,' 'shoe string,' 'night cap,' and a thousand others, 'bell,' 'shoe,' and 'night,' are substitutes for the possessive case. But we hesitate not to call these words adjectives. Some connect the two words with a hyphen, and call the united words a compound noun, but we conceive this to be as unnecessary as it would be to connect any other adjective with the noun it qualifies. Thus *rope* is the common name of a thing, *long* rope restricts the meaning of the noun, as do *large*, *old*, *new*, *cart* or *bell* rope. *Bell* and *cart* cease to be properly names, and serve to express the quality of things. Again, Charlotte when alone may be a noun, but when prefixed to the sirname, is merely a distinctive term. The office of the adjective, is merely to enable us to distinguish nouns, that is names, from each other. Mr. Wilson has three daughters. Wilson is the family name of each, but they must be distinguished. The father calls one the *good* daughter, another the *fair* daughter, and the third the *little* daughter; but he has another way of distinguishing them, and calls the first Charlotte, the second Harriet, and the third Caroline. Charlotte, Harriet, and Caroline, therefore, are true adjectives when used in this manner, and we shall endeavour to show that every possessive case in our language is no other than an adjective.

If a noun is the name of a thing, we think no one will deny that the English possessive is not a noun. '*Father's house*,' Father's in this sentence is not a name. *Father* to be sure is so, but *father's* implies more than the relation which exists between a parent and his child. In fact its original meaning is secondary, and subordinate to its new office, which is, to distinguish one house from another. We can see no difference between the office performed by the first words in the following sentences, and therefore are compelled to call them all adjectives. 'Noisy carriages;' 'Boston streets,' 'Boston's streets;' 'vernacular tongue,' 'mother tongue,' 'mother's tongue.' As we have hinted before, if the termination *'s* have any meaning, *father* and *father's* differ in meaning; and if *father* can be used alone, while *father's*, like any adjective, cannot make sense without a substantive, the *use* of the two words is different.

We cannot expect to resolve into their ancient forms all the words which ignorance, a defective system of orthography, or the natural inclination to clip and contract words in common use

may have rendered so unlike their original, that the relation can hardly be discovered; but it is really an object to reduce to their original class all such as may be reduced without doing violence to any etymological or grammatical principle.

In the body of our grammar we have introduced several classes of adjectives besides those generally allowed to be such. We shall make a few remarks upon some of these classes.

Murray allows all the words of the second and third classes to be either adjectives or adjective pronouns, that is, pronouns used as adjectives, except *an*, *a*, and *the*, which were examined under the head of articles.

The words in the fourth class he calls *pronouns*, and says 'they stand *instead* of nouns.' We assert that they are no more used *instead* of nouns than other adjectives are, whose nouns are understood. That they are generally used *without* the noun's being expressed, we allow, but this was not so much the case formerly as it is now; and even now, when we wish to avoid mistakes, and be very definite, we always insert the nouns. Of this, perhaps the most striking examples occur in legal forms, where, lest the pronoun (adjective) should point to the wrong word, the noun is always repeated. '*A pronoun is a word used instead of a noun, to avoid the too frequent repetition of the same word.*' This implies that the word has been once expressed, and *that* previously to using the pronoun.

'The man is happy, *he* is benevolent, *he* is useful.' *He* stands instead of man, it is said.

The man is happy, *happy* because benevolent, *happy* because useful, *happy* because contented, &c. Is *happy* a pronoun also? it seems to 'stand instead of' *man*.

Let us analyse Mr. Murray's sentence. *The* we have proved to be the same word as *this*, *these*, *that*, &c. It is then, '*This* or *That* man is happy,' &c. *He* is derived from the Latin adjective *Is*, which becomes *I*, Italian, pronounced *E*, and E in English with the breathing, or as we call it, H. *Is*, in Latin, generally means *that*, and is joined to a noun. *The* and *he*, then, are the same word in fact, and it is the same thing to say, *the* man is happy, *he* is benevolent, *he* is useful—or, *the* man is happy, *the* (man) is benevolent, *the* (man) is useful.

He does not stand instead of the word *man*, then, but instead of the word *the*. Even on Murray's ground, *he* must stand instead of both *the* and *man*; for *he* does not mean simply *man*, but *the man*, before mentioned.

Besides, if pronouns stand instead of nouns previously expressed, what is to be done when the pronoun comes first? 'We the subscribers.' 'Who art thou?' What do *we* and *who* stand instead of in these sentences? Does not the first

mean 'the we subscribers, or we persons the subscribers?' and does not the second mean, 'Who person art thou?' The latter sentence will not sound so awkward when it is recollected that our *who* is the Latin *Quis* or *quo*, which is an adjective, and generally has the noun expressed.

We cannot be so minute in regard to the other pronouns, although in some of them their adjective nature is more apparent than in *he*, which we selected because it is the example adduced by Mr. Murray. A few parallel sentences must suffice to illustrate our position.

I Paul, the apostle—— *The* or *this* Paul, the apostle.
Thou Lord of all—— *The* Lord of all.
We, the editor—— *The present* editor.
Ye hypocrites—— *These* hypocrites.
He, John, is sick—— *That** John is sick,
She, Sarah agrees—— *That* Sarah agrees.
They, owners, are brothers—— *Those* owners are brothers.

We do not assert that in these parallel expressions the words in italic have the *same meaning*, although we believe they come near it; but we do assert, that they are used in the same manner and for the same purpose, and, of course, must belong to the same class of words.

The words of our fifth class, with the exception of hers, ours yours, and theirs, are called adjective pronouns by Mr. Murray. The four above named he calls the possessive case of the personal pronouns. We have shown that the possessive case of nouns is merely an adjective, and there is no reason why the deputy should not share the fate of its principal. *Mine* and *thine* are allowed, *sometimes* at least, to be adjectives. It would be very unaccountable if the possessives *singular* of *I* and *thou* might be used as adjectives, while their *plural* possessives could

---

* *He* and *she* are acknowledged to be adjectives in such words as he-goat and she-goat, that is, *male* goat and *female* goat: and as *he* and *she* did not originally have distinct genders, this must be a somewhat modern application of the words. How unsettled the gender of *he*, *she* and *it*, is, may be gathered from the fact that any neuter noun may be, and many are usually called *he* and *she*, without 'a figure of speech;' for this custom is rather an adherence to ancient usage than a modern rhetorical use of the pronouns. My carpenter always says of his saw, *she* cuts well; and the sailor who never heard of rhetorick, says of the anchor, *he* holds, and of the ship, *she* brings up. We all say, *It* was I, you, he, she, they; *It* was a *man*, *woman*, or *tree*. I, thou, we, ye, you, they, have no genders.

not. This book is mine, this book is ours, this book is his, this book is theirs, this book is new. If it be said that *mine, his,* and *new* can be placed *before* the noun, but ours, yours, hers, theirs, cannot—I answer, that it is no condition of a word's being an adjective that it must be placed *before* a noun. Our pronouns are *all* borrowed from the Latin, where the adjective oftener follows than precedes the noun. Besides, there are other adjectives in English which always follow their nouns, as, A man *worth* a million—A prisoner quite *alone*, &c. If any more proof is wanted of these words being adjectives in their nature and use, let another adjective be substituted for them in the following sentences.

The injuries are *mine*—substitute, *great.*
The benefits were *thine;* ——— *small.*
The day is *yours;* ——— *cold.*
Liberty is *ours;* ——— *precious.*
The prize is *theirs;* ——— *valuable.*

We need not in these cases seek for a noun understood for the *pronouns* any more than for the acknowledged adjectives.

Besides, *mine, thine, his, its,* take their place before nouns expressed, and there are but four that cannot be so placed; so that the *numbers* are equal, as far as that argument goes. Again it must be recollected that ours, yours, hers, and theirs, should be written our's, your's, her's, and their's, —as they actually were written in former days,—then recollect that the apostrophe and *s* in this case, as in the case of nouns, mean *add* or *join*, and you may place the words before the noun at once.

We have little to add to what we have already said on the subject of the fifth class; but cannot forbear remarking that we have lately been amused by a grave discussion of the question, whether it is more proper to say, the *Miss* Howards, or the Misses *Howard.* There can be no doubt that the words in the plural are nouns, and the others adjectives. If we wish to distinguish the unmarried from the married Howards, we call them the *Miss* Howards: if we wish to distinguish these misses from other misses, we call them the Misses *Howard*, in which case, the word in italics is an adjective.

Under this head we class the present and past tenses of all regular verbs, when used without alteration, as adjectives. Perhaps we shall be better understood if we say that the past tense of regular verbs when used as an adjective, is what Murray calls a perfect participle. This, he says, has the nature of an adjective;—we believe it, and rank such words accordingly.

The 8th class includes what he calls the present participle of all verbs, and the perfect participle of all irregular verbs whose participles differ from the past tense. The participle is no more a part of the verb because formed from it, than an adjective is part of a noun from which it is formed; and there is as much propriety in calling such an adjective a participle, as in so calling an adjective formed from a verb. This, of course, will set aside the passive voice and all the compound tenses of verbs, but we prefer the English jackdaw in his plain suit of black, to the gaudy one bedecked with the borrowed finery of foreign peacocks.

In comparing adjectives, we prefer to say they are in the first, second, and third degree of comparison, for these terms seem to us *simpler* than the ordinary terms positive, comparitive, and superlative, besides being more correct. We object to the term *positive*, not because as some have profoundly objected, it is not a *degree* of comparison, for it is evident that every adjective implies a comparison of its noun with some other, for if a thing is high, it is high by comparison with something lower, and the *same thing* is always *high* in regard to some things, and *low* in regard to others. But we object to the terms *positive, comparative*, and *superlative*, because they are not definite. There is nothing in the first degree more *positive* than in the others. There is nothing in the comparative more comparable than in the other degrees. The superlative is no less objectionable, for superlatives are not always superlative. The *best* man is not so good as the *very best* man; and in our opinion, the term superlative is not applicable to the comparison of defect, as for instance, low, lower, lowest. Walker defines SUPERLATIVE, "*Expressing the highest degree*;" and POSITIVE, "*Not negative, real, absolute, certain.*" *Good* then is *positive*, but *better* is not. *Better* is *comparative*, but *best* is not. *Best* is *superlative*, and so is *least good*, and *very best* is *ultra-superlative*. We prefer simplicity.

We come next to the Verb.

Murray's definition of the verb is, 'A verb is a word that signifies to *Be*, to *Do*, or to suffer; as I *am*, I rule, I am ruled.'

We infer that *to Be* does not mean *to do* or *to suffer*: and to *suffer* means neither to *be* nor to *do*.

To Be, then, the first part of the definition does not express any action according to Mr. Murray. We shall not go back to the origin of this complex verb, which, more than any other, has puzzled grammarians; but merely state that the verb *to be* and its variations are fragments of *five* different verbs, not one of which signifies *abstract being*, and all of which govern

objects like active verbs. We shall endeavour to show that *be* is an active verb, and has all the properties of one, and if we establish this position, it will be unnecessary to say any thing about the action of other *neuter* verbs.*

If *to be* does not imply action, what is the difference between being and not being?

If *to be* does not imply action, how happens it that *Do not be a fool*, and *Do not act the fool* mean the same thing?

If *to be* does not allow *action*, how can a person *be active*?

God said 'Let light *be*.' Either nothing was done in obedience to this command, or what was done is expressed by the word *be*.

'*To talk* of industry is not *to be* industrious.

To talk of industry is not to *act* industriously.

To be brave is *to act* bravely.

Be diligent, be active, be moving, if you would be, or become or get rich.

In all these cases *Be* expresses at least the exertion of vitality, and it is no objection to say that this exertion is confined to the agent, for a hundred other verbs are said to confine their action to their agents.

To Be means to exist, to live, to have a state or condition: so say our best dictionaries. Either of these defining words may take an objective case after it.

To exist a miserable existence.

To live a good life.

To live as well as speak the praises of God.

To live a fool and die a sage.

To exist a man and die a beast.

To be a slave to one's passions.

It will not do to say that 'to exist a man' or 'be a slave,' means to exist *like* a man, or be *like* a slave. For to be like a slave and to be a slave are very different things.

---

* We have given in the grammar what we considered the most probable conjecture of the origin of the irregular verb *Be*, but the following by that skilful and fearless philologer, Gilchrist, has strong claims to our assent.

Am, he says, is the Greek *Eimi*, Latin *Sum*. *Is* is a corruption of *Esti*, Greek, *Est*, Latin. *Was* is a corruption of *Esse*, Latin, *were* is *Fuere*, Latin, *Furent*, French, the *nt* being silent. *Art* and *are* seem, he says, corrupted from *Weorth*, to be, Ang. Sax. *Be* is *Fio*, Latin, b, and f, often interchanging in all languages.

Murray says 'the verb *to be* through all its variations has the same case after it as that which precedes it.'—And after giving some examples, he adds 'By these examples it appears that this *substantive* verb has no government of case, *but serves in all its forms as a conductor to the cases*, so that the two cases which are the *next* before and after it, must always be alike.'

As the possessive case does not follow the verb to be, as its object, and as the nominative and objective are always spelled alike, Mr. Murray mistook the objective for the nominative. Under his XIth rule of syntax, his examples are all of *pronouns*, and only prove, what is the fact, that our pronouns once had no distinction of case. Had he given one instance of a *noun* before and after the verb, we should have taken it to illustrate our position. But let us see what he says farther on this subject.

'Perhaps this subject will be more intelligible to the learner, by (*his or my?*) observing that the words in the cases preceding and following the verb *to be*, may be said to be in *apposition* to each other, that is, they refer to the same thing, and are in the same case.'

Op-position would have been more correct, as they are on opposite sides of their '*conductor*.' What he means by calling the verb *to be* a 'conductor of cases,' I cannot imagine. He should have called it a *conjunction* at once; for, if the case before and after this verb *mean* the same thing, this similarity of meaning is caused by the verb, and they are united by it, and it is properly a conjunction.

The verb *to be* expresses action; but this action usually affects only the individual that exerts it. Hence most, if not all the objectives of this verb refer to, or mean the same person or thing as the nominative. But this is not peculiar to the verb *to be*, for 'John *plays* the fool' is a parallel case, to 'John *is* a fool,' and it is just as correct to say, that the word after *plays* is in *apposition* with John as that the word after *is* is so. But *plays* is an active verb, and *fool* the object of it, as much as *game* would be.

'John is a slave to his wife' means that he *submits* to all the servility she imposes on him.

In the sentence 'John is made a slave by his wife,' Murray would call slave an objective case, governed by the participle *made*, although the structure is the same as before; as the transposition of the words will show. 'John is a slave, made by his wife;' *made* being what he would call a participial adjective, *qualifying* the word slave, and not governing it.

Had Mr. Murray conjectured that the word *in apposition* was an adjective, he would have come nearer the truth, for we

have found no case where an adjective may not be substituted for the latter noun. Thus, 'John is a fool' is equivalent to 'John is foolish,' 'John is a slave,' means 'John is slavish.' This, however, will not apply when an adjective precedes the latter noun, as, 'John is a foolish man;' in which case *man* is the object of the verb *is*. If any more proof of the activity of the verb *to be* is required, let it be sought in what Murray calls the Imperative mood of *to Be;* as, Be quick, be diligent, be active, be still, be furious, &c. in all which cases *be* means *act, go, do, &c.* We think there is no need of our attempting to prove that verbs which mean *to suffer* mean also *to do*, we shall therefore pass on to Murray's division of verbs into *Active, passive*, and *neuter*.

He says, 'A verb *Active* expresses an action and necessarily implies an agent, and an object acted upon, as 'I love Penelope.'

We believe that every verb in our language will answer to this definition. The example he gives leads us to remark that the action is often *intellectual* merely, and not *physical*.

'A Verb *passive* expresses a passion, or a suffering, or the receiving of an action, and necessarily implies an object acted upon, and an agent by which it is acted upon; as, 'Penelope is loved by me.'

If Penelope *suffered* in consequence of being loved by Mr. Murray, it does not follow that *all* who are loved suffer. Nor, if this sense of the word suffer is objected to, does it follow that, because he loved Penelope, she *suffered* or *permitted* him to do so. But let us see what he calls a neuter verb.

'A verb neuter expresses neither action nor passion, but being, or a state or condition of being, as I *am*, I *sleep*, I *sit*.'

But our author says, 'In the phrases to dream a dream, to live a life, to run a race, to walk a horse, to dance the child, the verbs certainly assume a transitive form, and may not in these cases be improperly denominated transitive (that is, completely active) verbs.'

By this rule we can take his examples of neuter verbs cited above, (and he selected the best for his purpose that he could find,) and place a noun after them. I am a *being*, I sleep *myself* easy, I sit a *horse* well. These therefore are active verbs, and we assert that every verb in the language will as readily admit an object after it. Indeed, an ingenious philologer,*

---

* William S. Cardell of New-York, author of an Essay on Language, and The elements of English Grammar, two works to which we refer our readers for much important information in regard to the structure of language.

who ought to be better known in this country, has pretty clearly proved that every verb may have *two* objective cases after it.

But let us return to the Passive Verb. *'A passive verb is conjugated by adding the perfect participle to the verb to be.'* So this *neuter* verb becomes *passive* by having a participle placed after it, and a passive verb, like an active one, 'necessarily implies an agent and an object acted upon;' this, if true, would be all we claim for the verb *to be.*

'Penelope is loved.'

Is Penelope the agent and the object too? then Penelope loves herself; but, under the definition of an active verb it was said *'I* love Penelope.' What then is the difficulty? plainly this, that *loved* is not a verb. 'Penelope *is* or *exists*,' how does she exist? loved or hated as the case may be. Loved is an adjective and qualifies Penelope, as any other adjective would, and it is just as correct to say the phrase 'Penelope is *sick*, or *old*, or *ugly*' is a *passive verb*, as to call 'Penelope is loved' one. The perfect participle is a mere adjective and the whole Passive voice is built upon a misconception of its nature and use.

If any thing is wanted to complete the climax of absurdities, it may be found in the fact that, although the perfect participle, whose action is *finished*, may, with the verb *to be*, form a *passive* voice, the present participle whose action is *going on* is allowed no such privilege. *'Penelope is loved'* is a *passive* verb, and expresses a passion, or suffering, but *'Penelope is loving'* expresses no passion, no suffering, although by the custom of civilized society she is obliged to keep her passion to herself, and suffer the consequences. We are very much inclined to think there is more passion and suffering in this case than in the other; and the verb *to be* in all its moods and tenses may be joined with the participle in *ing* as well as with that in *ed.*

To Verbs, says our author, belong Number, Person, Mood and Tense.

One would think that the plural of verbs was spelled differently from the singular, but this is not the case. What Murray calls the plural is always the same as his first person singular, in all his moods and tenses, and in some moods it is the same as *all* the persons singular.

I love	We love	I loved	We loved
If thou love	Ye love	If thou loved	Ye loved
If he love	They love	He loved	They loved

His imperative mood allows no variation even in the second and third persons singular.

His potential and subjunctive moods confine their variation to the *auxiliary* as he calls it, and the *principal* verb is unaltered.

What then .is meant by the *number* of verbs ? We answer, *' the number of the Pronouns !'* And it is *just as* correct to attribute number to verbs as to *adjectives*, and Mr. Murray, to have been consistent should have called all adjectives that qualify plural nouns, plural adjectives. In the following sentences we have yet to learn why the adjective is not as much plural as the verb, or rather why the verb is not as much singular as the adjective.

If *I* be *sick.*
If *We* be *sick.*

It is just so with the *Person* of Verbs. Mr. Murray, having previously determined that pronouns had three persons, was resolved to find corresponding variations in the verb.

First Tense.	Second Tense.
I love or love I.	I loved or loved I.
Thou lovest or lovest thou.	*Thou lovedst* or lovedst thou.
Thou love or love thou.	Thou loved, or loved thou.
He loves or *loveth* or loves or loveth he.	He loved, or loved he.
He love or love he.	
We love or love we.	We loved, or loved we.
Ye love or love ye.	Ye loved or loved ye.
They love or love they.	They loved, or loved they.

The above are all the *variations* of the verb love in all its voices, moods, tenses, numbers and persons; for the place of the pronoun, and the assistance of other words, have nothing to do with *love.*

The first person singular and three persons plural, admit no more variation for *person* than for number. The unchanged verb is also used in the second and third persons singular of the subjunctive and imperative moods of Murray.

The terminations *est, eth, s, ed,* and *edst,* once had a meaning, which was, *add* or *join,* and there is no more propriety in adding them to the second and third persons singular than to the other persons. Indeed, if the clergy when they left off worshipping in Latin, had not retained a love for such phraseology as differed from that of the *vulgar,* the terminations, *est, eth,* and *edest* would have fallen entirely into disuse in these

two persons, as they did in all others, for the time has been when *eth* was the common termination of all the persons. It was the duty of grammarians to prevent or correct such anomalies; but the first English grammarians were clergymen; and so far from rejecting the absurdity we complain of, they not only admitted it as canonical, but dignified it with the appellation of the *solemn style*, in opposition to the *regular* style in general use. They should have invented a *solemn* style for the other persons also.

That *eth* was once a termination common to other persons than the third singular may be seen in the following extract.

> 'Hevene and erthe he *oversieth*
> His eghen *bith* full brighte,
> Sunne and mone and all sterren
> *Bieth* thiestre on his lihte,
> He wot huet *thencheth* and huet *doeth*
> All quicke wihte.'

In consequence of its difficult utterance, *Eth* soon after changed into *et, it, ed, en, es, est, &c.*

In Sancta Margaretta, which is supposed to have been written about the end of the 12th century, we have

> Old ant yonge *I preit* ou oure solief for to lete
> *Thenchet* on God that yef ou wit oure sunnes to bete
> Here may *tellen* ou wid words feire ant swete
> The vie of one meidan was *hoten* Maregrete, &c.

Do, did, ed, et, eth, &c. are from the same source, hence our custom of omitting the *ed*, as a termination when *did* precedes the verb; thus, I fear-*ed* I did fear, that is, *I (join* the sensation of) *fear*.

We have *ed* as a common affix in our language, and the idea of *time* is no more connected with it than with *ish*, or any other termination. In such cases as crooked back, crook-backed; the *connective ed* may be joined to either word and the same meaning retained.

We intend that these remarks shall bear upon the subject of *tense* as well as *person*; for, if it be true that the terminations we are considering primarily meant *join*, and have no reference to *time, number*, or *person*, having been used indiscriminately for all tenses, persons and numbers, the system of tenses must necessarily fall with the rest of the absurdities raised upon a misunderstanding of these terminations.

We hesitate not to say that the whole system of moods, tenses, numbers and persons, is got up to accommodate these few relics of ancient usage. Could it be proved that *est* in connection with *thou*; and *eth*, or *es*, in connection with *he*, exclusively, served any useful purpose, it would be very proper to protect and perpetuate them by grammatical laws. But instead of being useful they are worse than useless, for they serve to perplex and enslave the English speaker or writer. In *our* opinion grammarians should pay no respect to *usage*, except so far as it is consistent with the nature and analogy of the language whose laws they pretend to expound. Any unnecessary departure from strict analogy, simplicity or uniformity, should be met and discountenanced, if of modern origin, and stripped and discarded, if muffled in the venerable cloak of *usage*. It is this *usage*, which has always been the firmest friend of *abuse* in religion, politics and letters, but we trust the day has come, when truth shall no longer bow down to *usage*, *authority*, and *expediency*, that 'holy alliance,' which have always said to her 'thus far shalt thou go but no farther.'

'Mood,' says Murray, 'is a particular form of the verb showing the manner in which the being, action, or passion is represented.'

We cannot better illustrate the subject of moods and tenses than by giving a specimen of each, and referring the reader to the verb *Love*, of all whose *real* changes, or forms, we have given a paradigm in a previous part of this essay. (See p. 171.)

Infinitive Mood. TO LOVE.

Murray calls *to Love* the verb, and the infinitive, but *to* has nothing to do with the verb, except to govern it as it does other *nouns*.

Indicative Mood.

Present. *I love.* —— this is *our* first tense.
Imperfect. *I loved.* —— this is our second tense.
Perfect. *I have loved.* —— *I have* is the present tense of another verb, and *loved* a participle or verbal adjective qualifying whatever *I have*.
Pluperfect. *I had loved.* *I had* is the second tense of *I have*, and *loved* a participle as before.
First future. *I shall or will love.* *I shall* or *will* is the first tense of other verbs, and *love* the infinitive of Mr. M.

Second future. *I shall have loved.* *I shall* is the first tense as before. *Have* is the infinitive. *Loved* the participle qualifying whatever I shall have.

Mr. Murray has tried hard 'to mark time more accurately,' but the German grammarians have beat him, for they have *four future tenses.*

Imperative Mood.

No name to the tense! *Let me love.* That is 'Permit thou me to love.'

Let thou, is the imperative of *to Let.*

Love thou. We have given this already in our first tense.

Do thou love. *Do thou* is the imperative, as Murray calls it, of the verb *do.* *Love* is the infinitive already given.

Let him love. Permit thou him to love.

Let us love. Permit thou us to love.

Love ye or you. Our first tense.

Do ye love. *Do ye* is the imperative of *do.* *Love* the infinitive of *Love.*

Let them love. Permit thou them to love. *Let thou* the imperative as before, and *Love* the infinitive.

And all this for the sake of creating an Imperative mood for the verb Love!

Potential Mood.

Present. *I may or can love.* I may or can is the first tense of may and can. *Love* is the infinitive of love.

Imperfect. *I might, could, would, or should love.* I might, I could, I would, and I should are the second tense of may, can, will, and shall. *Love* is the infinitive as before.

Perfect. *I may or can have loved.* I may and I can are the first tense. *Have* is the Infinitive, *loved* the participle of *Love,* and qualifies whatever I may or can have.

Pluperfect. *I might, could, would, or should have loved.* I might, &c. are the second tense of may, &c. *Have* is the infinitive and *loved* a participle, qualifying whatever I might have.

Subjunctive Mood.

Present. *If I love.* Already given without *if* in my first tense. *If* has the same to do with *love* as *do* has in the sentence *Do thou love,* for *if* means *give* or *grant.*

Even Murray himself, who assigns six tenses to the subjunctive mood, says ' all the rest are similar to the corresponding tenses of the indicative mood.'

We think this *exposé* must satisfy any fair mind that an attempt has been made to force the English language to wear forms that were made to suit some foreign tongue.

In a *Latin* Grammar it may be necessary to express by an English *phrase* the meaning of the numerous variations of Latin verbs, but it is monstrous to pretend that all such *phrases* are tenses of our own verb.

Have, shall, will, may and *can* have words in English which mean the same thing, thus,

I have wine loved.
I hold wine loved.

I shall love.
I ought to love.

I will love.
I intend to love.

I may love.
I am permitted to love.

I can love.
I ken to love, that is
I know how to love.

Will the lovers of numerous tenses allow that these synonymous *phrases* are also *tenses* of the verb *love?* We might amuse ourselves at the expense of the *names* of Mr. M.'s tenses and moods, and their total inapplicability, but we shall content ourselves with merely remarking that there is no shadow of reason for any distinction of moods, and no other reason for even *two* tenses than can be found in a difference of termination which has no reference to *time*, we mean the addition of *ed* to the simple verb. What is called the present tense expresses future time *as well as* Mr. Murray's *phrase* does; and what is called the past tense does the same. We say *as well as*, because we believe that the verb of itself never expresses *any time*, but the expression of *time* must be looked for in the context.

I sail *now*, or *to-morrow*, or *always*.
To be *yesterday*, *to-day*, and *forever*.
Would he be satisfied if I *went* next week.
Will he be satisfied, if I *go* next week.
If I please next year I *can* visit you.
If I *pleased*, next year I *could* visit you.

I loved and other verbs in *ed* have been so long connected with words expressing past time, that we attribute this expression to the verb, but to *I loved* we may without impropriety add the strongest expression of present time, that words can convey, as, I loved *this very instant*, or *this present moment*;

and the present tense will make good sense with the strongest expression of *future* time. *I am*, the very queen of present tenses, affords one of the best expressions of future time; as, I am to love, &c.

Adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections remain to be considered. We shall be brief in our remarks upon them.

Adverbs.

'An adverb is a part of speech joined to a verb, an adjective, and sometimes to another adverb to express some quality or circumstance respecting it, as He reads *well*; A *truly* good man; He writes *very correctly*.'

Suppose, instead of 'He reads well,' we put 'He lies well.' *Well*, we are told, is an adverb and qualifies *lies*. Suppose then we put *crooked* or *sick* instead of *well*. No one pretends that they are adverbs, and yet they are just as much so as *well* is.

Truly, correctly and all other adverbs ending in *ly* are compound adjectives, the *ly* being a contraction of *like*. This double adjective, when separated, reads thus, 'a good man *like true* (men.')

Very is an adjective and means *true*.
He *very* writes *like correct* (writers.)

However odd such a resolution of the sentence may seem, we believe, it will admit of no other, and even Mr. Murray allows that the *ly*, is a contraction of *like*. The other adverbs are either adjectives or contracted phrases, all of which are ingeniously explained in Horne Tooke's 'Diversions of Purley.'

Prepositions.

'Prepositions serve to connect words with one another and to show the relation between them. 'He went from London to York;' 'She is *above* disguise.' 'They are supported *by* industry.'

We venture to say that from this definition no body could pick a preposition from the mass of words which form our language. Prepositions *connect* words! 'He went *from* Lon-

don;' *from* connects him with London! 'He went *to* York;' *to* connects him with York! Or perhaps he means that *from* and *to* connect London and York! 'She is *above* disguise,' and yet *above* fastens disguise to her! 'They are supported *by* industry.' 'They are supported *without* industry.' In these two cases, no doubt, *by* and *without* connect *industry* with *them*! *From*, *above*, and *without*, in the examples just adduced, show strongly that *no relation* exists between the nouns.

The fact is, all the prepositions, like the adverbs, may be found among the other parts of speech, retaining their original meaning.

From is a noun and means *beginning*.

To is a noun and means *end*.

Above is an adjective qualifying *she*, or a noun meaning *on top of*.

By is our verb *Be*, and the sentence above may be thus expressed. 'Be industry (or let industry be) they are supported.

Without means, *leave out* or *be out*.

So much for Mr. Murray's definition and illustration of prepositions. Those who wish for more information in regard to them may consult the author referred to under adverbs.

Conjunctions.

'Conjunctions are chiefly used to *connect* sentences or words.'

Conjunctions then, we suppose, *connect* sentences as prepositions do, but show no 'relation between them.'

We are really puzzled to know in what this *connection* consists. In the case of prepositions, no connection of either of word or sentiment was expressed; and no sooner are we told that conjunctions *connect*, than we are told that they are divided into two sorts, copulative (that is, *connecting*) and disjunctive (that is, *separating*.)

The word *and* is the verb *add*, and *add* may always be substituted for it; thus, two *and* two are four, two *add* two are four. Hence Murray does well to give as an example of copulative conjunctions, 'He and his brother reside in London.' His other examples are,

'I will go *if* he will accompany me.'

'You are happy *because* you are good.'

If is the verb *give* (or grant) which was formerly spelled *gif*; and the sentence means '*grant* he will accompany me, I will go.'

Be-cause means the cause *be* or *is* (for *be* was once used where we now use *is*.) The sentence would then be, 'You are happy, *the cause is* you are good :'

But, independent of the *meaning* of the words *if* and *because*, we need only transpose them to show that the connecting or disconnecting of sentences is no part of their business ; for put the first clause of the sentence last, and the conjunction ceases to connect, thus,

'*If* he will accompany me, I will go.'

'*Because* you are good, you are happy.'

'The conjunction disjunctive (happy contradiction) serves not only to connect and continue the sentence (as the copulative did) but also to express *opposition of meaning* in different degrees. Of course this means that copulative conjunctions do *not* express opposition of meaning. The examples are,

Though he was frequently reproved, *yet* he did not reform.

They came with her *but* went away without her.

Let us substitute a copulative for these disjunctives.

He was frequently reproved, *and* he did not reform.

If he was frequently reproved, *yet* he did not reform.

They came with her *and* went away without her.

Yet is entirely unnecessary after *though*. It is another spelling of the word *get ;* and *though* is a verb, meaning precisely the same as *if*, viz. *grant* or *give*.

But has two meanings exactly opposite. Sometimes it means *except* or *leave out*, and sometimes *add*. When it has the latter meaning, *and* may take its place. When it means *leave out, without* may be substituted for it. Murray does not appear to have known this fact. and therefore has given *but* to *add* or *join*, as an example of *disjunctive* conjunctions ! *But* to *add* was originally spelled *bot*, and our verb *to boot*, that is, to *superadd*, is the very verb.

We have not room to explain all the conjunctions in this manner ; *but* we have examined his own examples in order to prove that Murray did not understand their nature or use.

Interjections.

No *word* can properly be called an interjection. Most of Murray's interjections are verbs in what he calls the imperative mood, such as lo ! (that is, *look*) behold ! hush ! halt ! We cannot better express our sentiments than by transcribing the remarks of Horne Tooke on this subject.

'The dominion of speech is erected upon the downfall of interjections. Without the artful contrivances of language, mankind would have nothing but interjections with which to com-

municate orally any of their feelings. The neighing of a horse, the lowing of a cow, the barking of a dog, the purring of a cat, sneezing, groaning, shrieking, and every other involuntary convulsion, with oral sound, have almost as good a right to be called parts of speech as interjections have. Voluntary interjections are only employed when the suddenness or vehemence of some affection or passion returns men to their natural state, and makes them for a moment, forget the use of speech, or when from some circumstance, the shortness of time will not permit them to exercise it.'

Thus it will be seen that there are two kinds of English Grammar, Rational and Arbitrary. And we shall conclude our strictures with some remarks of Gilchrist, to whom we have been indebted for many, very many useful hints, and much important information.

Speaking of Rational and Arbitrary Grammar, 'The first,' he says, 'is intelligible, and useful, the last is a jumble of unintelligibleness and absurdity, in theory, and is attended with no utility, but much inconvenience and trouble in practice. The cause of this inconvenience and trouble is, that arbitrary rules of speech are imposed which have the same effect as fetters or cumbrous armour. The reason of the unintelligibleness and absurdity of grammar as set forth by grammatists, is their misty notion of *propriety*, which they one while consider as identical with reason, and another while as identical with custom. They would unite these two into a beautiful system, which is about as practicable as to amalgamate the most incoherent bodies.

Rational Grammar is a desideratum, as the grammatical rules of every language are in many respects abused, being calculated to render it not more but less fit for its professed purpose. Happily, though the principle of utility has been little regarded, and though there has been much blind legislation to establish a despotick system of syntactick propriety, our language is yet one of the simplest and freest in the world, and with a very moderate reform, might be wholly disencumbered from all grammatick difficulty. We are surely as competent to improve our grammar as to simplify and improve our machinery; and we have only to lay aside one of the double forms of the pronouns (that is the nominative or objective case) or to agree that either form shall be proper in any position—to substitute *Be*, as a regular verb, for that jumble of anomaly now employed—to throw away the useless termination *est*, *eth*, *es*, or *s*, and to disallow all anomalies of verbs, nouns and adjectives.

The only imaginable objection to such grammatick improvement is, " that it would appear strange," but so is every thing new, however excellent, until we become used to it. We have only to set up an enlightened and useful custom in the room of the old, absurd and inconvenient usage, and it will immediately begin to acquire the venerable qualities of the approved, established and ancient form of speech ; and the oldest institutions and customs were once new.

If it be asked, what is the amount of utility in the proposed alteration ? We answer, it is considerable in every view of the question. It is important to have a sensible instead of a senseless kind of grammar ; one for which satisfactory reasons can be assigned to youth, and foreigners. It is of considerable utility to have an easy instead of a difficult kind of syntactick propriety, for, with the former, the writer or speaker is enabled to direct his whole consideration to the justness of his thoughts and the meaning of his words. * * * * * * *

The reader is now sufficiently aware of the true character of *Arbitrary* grammar. It was not dictated by reason, and therefore cannot be referred to any rational principles. But though we wish to see it discarded by a general disuse of all anomalies and unmeaning terminations, and changes of verbs and pronouns, yet such reform must be effected by the influential members of the literary world. All others must be content with established usage. They must endeavour to write and speak grammatically, merely to avoid the imputation of ignorance and illiterateness. In this, as in so many other things, we must submit to bondage, for we are not free to follow reason, unless we have sufficient hardihood to set publick opinion at defiance."

We intended to have collected in a body the remarks of all our best etymologists upon the defects which abound in the prevailing system of English grammar, but we have already made too large a book, and shall therefore conclude with one extract from Dr. Wallis, which is a sort of summary of all that we have said. Omnes ad Latinæ linguæ normam hanc nostram Anglicanam nimium exigentes multa inutilia præcepta de nominum *casibus, generibus,* et *declinationibus,* atque verborum *temporibus, modis* et *conjugationibus,* de nominum item et verborum *regimine,* ali isque similibus tradiderunt, quæ a lingua nostra sunt prorsus aliena, adeoque confusionem potius et obscuritatem pariunt quam explicationi inserviunt.

END.

B. P. L. Bindery
JUL 2 1906